

E13492

LORD HERVEY'S MEMOIRS
VOLUME TWO



By the gracious permission of H.M. the King

FREDERICK, PRINCE OF WALES
AND HIS SISTERS
by J. F. Nollekens

SOME MATERIALS TOWARDS
MEMOIRS
OF THE REIGN OF KING GEORGE II

By JOHN, LORD HERVEY

Printed from a copy of the original manuscript in the
Royal Archives at Windsor Castle; and from the
original manuscript at Ickworth

EDITED BY
ROMNEY SEDGWICK
Sometime Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge

IN THREE VOLUMES

VOL. II



LONDON: 1931

MANUFACTURED IN GREAT BRITAIN

SOME MATERIALS
TOWARDS
MEMOIRS OF THE REIGN
OF
KING GEORGE THE SECOND

(Continued)

THE Emperor sent into Italy near 50,000 men, 1734 the flower of the Imperial troops, under the command of Count Merci, an old brutal, hot-headed German of fourscore, who had lost his sight, and had all the infirmities of age without the experience, and all the heat of youth without the vigour of it.

To the Rhine he sent Prince Eugene with only 22,000 men to oppose 100,000, and to wait there the arrival of the quotas to be furnished by the princes of the empire, who were as slow to send them as he was pressing to demand them. This disposition of affairs made Count Starhemberg tell His Imperial Majesty at Vienna that he had sent an army without a general into Italy, and a general without an army to the Rhine. A reflection very well applied, which he borrowed from Suetonius; for when Cæsar was going into Spain to make war there on the Lieutenants of Pompey, and intended upon their reduction to return and follow Pompey into Greece, Suetonius reports Cæsar to have said, "Ire se ad exercitum sine duce, et inde reversurum ad ducem sine exercitu."

1734 The consequence of this disposition of affairs to the Emperor was that Italy was soon lost. 30,000 Spaniards, commanded by Count Montemar, marched through the Ecclesiastical States to Naples, soon subdued it, and set Don Carlos (who went at the head of them their titular general) on the throne of that kingdom. The Emperor had 12,000 men (as good troops as any in the world) then in Naples; but as they were commanded by Visconti, then Viceroy of Naples, an old timid dotard, who knew little of civil and nothing of military affairs, these troops were so disposed that no defence was made against the Spaniards that gave any lustre to the wreaths of their triumph.

This ignorant, superannuated coward, taken out of the Cabinet of the Archduchess at Brussels (where he had nothing to do but raise taxes and keep up Austrian formality), and set at the head of this Government in this difficult conjuncture, knew not which way to turn, or what measures to take; and, instead of collecting his forces to make any stand against the first invasion of the Spaniards, he shut up 4,000 men in Gaeta, 4,000 more in Capua, and with the other 4,000 deserted Naples, and ran he knew not whither up into the country towards Apulia, with what effects of his own he could carry off, leaving his master's affairs to take care of themselves.

By these means about 17,000 Spaniards, very bad troops, who advanced before the rest, and might easily have been defeated by the Imperialists led on by an able general, took possession of Naples, and there crowned Don Carlos without striking a blow. They then pursued the Viceroy, who narrowly escaped himself by the mountains, whilst every man of his miserable little army was either killed or taken prisoner.

May 25 This battle was called the Battle of Bitonto; and the Count Montemar, in consequence of this and all his other services, was created Duke of Bitonto by Don Carlos as soon as ever Don Carlos was crowned King of Naples. Gaeta and Capua were soon after besieged and taken,

which left the new King of Naples in absolute and quiet 1734 possession of the whole kingdom, save only two or three little inconsiderable places, very improperly called forts, which were soon after reduced. The son of the Pretender was sent a volunteer to the siege of Gaeta in great state, and received with great honours and distinctions by Don Carlos. His retinue consisted of a governor, a master of the horse, four gentlemen of the bedchamber, and inferior domestics in proportion. Gratitude from princes nobody expects (at least who knows them). It was therefore, in that light merely considered, no wonder to see Don Carlos making those troops which the King of England's fleet had brought two years before into Italy treat the pretended heir to his crown as if he had been the true one. But what the policy of the counsels of Spain could be in permitting this step is inconceivable.

As soon as Mr. Keene, the English Minister at the Court of Spain, heard of this proceeding, he complained of it to Patino and said, though he had received no orders yet from England to mention it, he did not believe it would be well taken. Patino immediately, as first Minister, told Mr. Keene that his Court would absolutely disavow the measure. He declared in the name of his master that no offence was meant to be given to the King of England, and that, since Mr. Keene thought offence would be taken at it, he would immediately despatch a courier to Naples (which accordingly he did) to order the Pretender's son to be sent back. At the same time, Patino told Mr. Keene that in a private character he would own to him exactly the manner in which this thing had come about. The Duke of Liria, he said, son to the Duke of Berwick, who was cousin-german to this boy, had when in Don Carlos's army asked leave of the Court of Spain to bring his cousin there a volunteer, and the Court of Spain, not thinking it an affair of any consequence, had obliged the Duke of Liria in this request; but that, for receiving the boy as Prince of Wales, or paying him any

1734 honours as a king's son, he was sure no such thing had been done.

Nevertheless, it was currently reported and generally believed to be otherwise, and that the boy had been received by Don Carlos with all the honours and distinctions that could be showed to him. Particulars, too, were told that confirmed people in this opinion, especially one, which was that Don Carlos and this boy coming back together to Naples in a galley from Gaeta, the hat of the young Pretender fell into the sea, and, the mariners going to take it up, Don Carlos cried out, "It is no matter, it floats towards England, and the owner will soon go fetch it; and, that I may have something to fetch too, mine shall accompany it." Upon that he threw his own hat into the sea, whilst the whole retinue of both Princes set up a huzza, all threw their hats into the sea, and cried "Al Inghilterra! al Inghilterra!"

Montijo, at London, took the same turn that Patino did at Madrid; he absolutely denied that Spain had countenanced this measure, and said to the Duke of Newcastle that orders were sent, as soon as the thing was known, to have the boy recalled.

However, this excuse in reality was a very insufficient recompense, the affront having been public and the reparation private.

The King and Queen, too, were both extremely hurt at it; but Sir Robert Walpole very wisely told them there was no medium to be held in their conduct, and they must either seem quite satisfied with the apology made for the affront, or must thoroughly resent it, and forbid Montijo the Court. He said Their Majesties' situation was such, that, if they had a mind to quarrel with Spain, this incident no doubt gave them a handle to do it; but if they had no mind to it, he thought the excuse that had been made for the impertinence of Spain was sufficient to justify their honour in overlooking it. The latter was the part they took.

After the reduction of the kingdom of Naples the 1734 resolution was taken by the Spaniards of making an immediate descent upon Sicily. Accordingly an army of 18,000 foot and 2,000 horse, under the command of the Duke of Bitonto, with a fleet of 30 sail, was sent to make that conquest. They soon completed it, the three towns of Messina, Trapani, and Syracuse, which held out longer than the rest, only excepted.

And here I cannot help remarking that this unhappy island seems from the beginning of its existence, at least from the earliest accounts that history unmixed with fable affords us of its fortune, to have been marked out by Heaven as an object of successive calamities. And even those things which are called blessings to other countries have proved such curses to this that they have contributed chiefly to sharpen and promote the series of its misfortunes. I mean by these commonly esteemed blessings the apt situation of Sicily for trade, the fertility of her fields, than which, says Justin, "*nulla terra feracior fuit*"; the plentifulness of her harvests, her vineyards, and her olive-trees; the strength of her cities, and the opulence of her people; all which have constantly drawn the eyes of her neighbours upon her, excited their envy, and made them turn their arms to so tempting and desirable an acquisition :

Populus Romanus, mox quum videret opulentissimam in proximo prædam, quodammodo Italie suæ abscissam et quasi revulsam, adeo cupiditate ejus exarsit ut quantenus nec mole jungi nec pontibus posset, armis belloque jungenda et ad continentem suam revocanda bello videretur. (Florus.)

Hujus ob discordias perpetuas potentiorum injuriis exposita pulchritudo invitavit. (Livy.)

When Sicily was under a democratic government, intestine violence, jarring factions, popular tumults, and civil contests, disturbed her peace, laid waste her plains, destroyed her cities, and thinned her inhabitants, with a rage equal to that of foreign wars, and produced events not less fatal than those consequential to the entrance of a

1734 conquering external foe. Whenever Sicily has been a province to other states, it has proved the common fate of all other provinces in being drained by the prince and harassed by his vicegerent. When every great city of the island had a prince of its own, or when the greatest part of the island was under the dominion of one king, the government was especially grievous, oppressive, and cruel; whilst such a numerous succession of these royal spoilers was inflicted on this miserable country, that the name of a Sicilian king has been made proverbial to this day. "*Siculi per annos sane multos externa simul ac civilia bella, et nocentius utrisque malum, tyrannidem passi.*" (Livy.)

A tyrant originally meant nothing more than an absolute ruler, but absolute rule being so apt to deviate into oppression, the title of Tyrant, which was at first only synonymous to King, by the general conduct of kings became at last synonymous to an oppressor. The little verbal distinctions between absolute, arbitrary, and destructive sway were lost in practice; they were one and the same thing; and for this reason the name of Tyrant, or *τυραννος*, was not more feared or detested by the Greeks than that of King or Rex was by the Romans. Among the last, even those men who, in the height of the Roman grandeur and the decline of Roman virtue, usurped the most unlimited power, avoided still the odium of calling themselves by that hateful and detested name, but, sheltering themselves under the less formidable titles of Emperor and Prince of the Senate, and vested with the authority of the Tribunitian power, less obnoxious than that of regal sway, they failed not, under another denomination of government, to act all those injustices which the people, ever more intent on names than things, would not perhaps have borne had they been inflicted by a magistrate under a different appellation.

The first account we have of this island proving the hardships of foreign invasion and dominion was the descent made there by the Carthaginians a little before

the time of expulsion of the kings out of Rome. Xerxes, 1734 when he meditated the conquest of all Greece, fomented these wars of the Carthaginians in Sicily in order to draw forces out of Greece to maintain what the Greeks there possessed, and of course to leave Greece itself more exposed to the irruptions he designed there. Three years the Carthaginians spent in preparations for this descent on Sicily, and then attacked it with an army of 300,000 men and 2,000 ships of war. How the address and bravery of Gelon, Tyrant of Syracuse, saved Sicily from ruin by the destruction of this vast Carthaginian fleet and army everybody knows, and that the Carthaginians and Xerxes, who had entered into this mutual alliance in order to make the conquest of all Sicily for the first and all Greece for the last, were both defeated on the same day, the one near Palermo, the other at Thermopylæ, by the memorable sacrifice of 300 Spartans.

Sicily after this became the theatre of a fierce and bloody contest between the Athenians and Lacedæmonians, the last sending succours to the Syracusians to defend them against the assaults of the first. "*Totius Græciæ bellum in Siciliam translatum erat.*" (Justin).

The Carthaginians under the first Hannibal amply revenged the destruction they had suffered from the hand of Gelon. They made a new descent on Sicily, and with innumerable unspeakable cruelties destroyed and dismantled many of their cities, and put all the inhabitants to the sword.

Peace was then made with the Carthaginians by Dionysius the Elder, but it was short, and only made in order to prepare for the long and sanguine war that soon followed.

Immense were the sufferings of Sicily during this war, as well from their own kings as from their enemies, but particularly after the accession of the Tyrant Dionysius the Younger, who, in the alternate fortunes of sovereignty, banishment, restoration, and re-exile, was equally fatal to

1734 this distressed country; for at that time Icetas, Tyrant of the Leontines, and Timoleon, General of the Corinthians (both called in to assist the two different factions then in Sicily), together with the Carthaginians (who hoped to make advantage of these divisions), were all three afflicting this miserable island at once.

Pyrrhus, King of Epirus, made a descent into Sicily, and in the space of one year or little more won it and lost it.

Siculi tradentes Pyrrho totius insulæ imperium quæ assidiis Carthaginiensium bellis vexabatur. (Justin.)

Pyrrho in Sicilia omnia sibi prona reperiente. (Livy.)

Pyrrhus maxima Siculorum alacritate exceptus est oppida, agros, pecunias, naves, certatim tradentium. (Livy.)

Pyrrhus imperium tam cito amisit quam acquisierat. (Justin.)

His arrival and his departure were both marked with those traces of slaughter and devastation that always attend such sudden revolutions in a country where the prize contested for is so valuable and the contesting parties so powerful. That such causes constantly produce such effects was, in all probability, the opinion of Pyrrhus himself when upon quitting Sicily he said to his courtiers—"O, amici, qualem Romanis et Carthaginensibus palæstram relinquimus!" (*Livy.*) "Affectabat enim ut Pœnus, ita Romanus Siciliam; et eodem tempore, paribus uterque votis ac viribus, imperium orbis agitabat." (*Florus.*)

Pyrrhus's prophecy was quickly verified: "Quod presagium paulo post longa inter hos bella tot utrimque submersæ classes tot acies cæsæ satis superque impleverunt." (*Livy.*) Sicily was not only the first but the fiercest theatre of that deplorable war between the Romans and Carthaginians which lasted so many years, and was pursued with a vigour equal to the incitement, which was nothing less than an universal dominion of what was then, though unjustly, called the world.

For this great prize Sicily was made the first stage of combat, and suffered all those misfortunes which two of

the greatest, the bravest, the most potent, and most expert of nations of any age in alternate conquests must necessarily inflict on that country that most immediately feels the fluctuations of such power. 1734

At length the Romans became sole masters of this island, and were the first masters that ever possessed it entire. What the fertility of its harvests must have been is easy to conceive, when it was called in the most flourishing time of the Empire "*Romæ Granarium*."

To the Romans it long continued a province, taxed, squeezed, impoverished, oppressed, exhausted.

On the declension of the Roman empire in the year 739 and the reign of Theodosius the Younger, Sicily was subdued and ravaged by that great conqueror Genseric, King of the Spanish Vandals. Under the dominion of these barbarians Sicily groaned for near a hundred years; after which space it was in the time of the Emperor Justinian reconquered by his renowned general, Belisarius.

In the year 827 the Saracens got possession of Sicily, established themselves there, and maintained the government of the island, at least of Palermo, for above two hundred years under the Emirs.

The Saracens were driven out by the Normans under the command of the two brothers Robert and Roger Guiscard. The last of these, called Roger the Hump-backed, made himself absolute master of Sicily, and took the title of Earl. In the person of his son, who succeeded him, and was for his tyranny, avarice, and cruelties called William the Bad, the ancient spirit of a Dionysius or an Agathocles seemed to revive, as if cruelty and oppression always attached to the regal dignity, and that their governor was always to be their oppressor, and their guardian their destroyer.

On the death of William, the son of this king, this island, for want of a legitimate son to that prince, was plunged again into all the calamities and horrors of civil contests. Tancred the Bastard usurped the throne, and

1734 after a short disturbed reign of three years resigned his crown with his life, leaving a son, who, after having had his eyes put out, died in prison.

To these troubles soon after succeeded those occasioned by Manfred, natural son to the Emperor Frederick II., which Frederick, in right of his mother, Constance, daughter of William the Bad of Sicily and wife to the Emperor Henry VI., died in possession of this island.

Manfred smothered his father, the Emperor Frederick, with a pillow, and poisoned his brother Conrad, who was the legitimate son of Frederick, and in possession of Sicily—exploits that show he had qualities which, in case he made himself master of Sicily, would prevent him deviating from the character of a true Sicilian King. Under the pretence of making himself tutor to Conradinus, the son of Conrad, he usurped the government, and after a reign of eleven years, almost as troublesome to himself as to his subjects, he was slain in battle, after having been excommunicated by Pope Urban IV., who was the occasion of his overthrow by calling in Charles of Anjou to depose him, which Charles, in prejudice of Conradin, the true heir, was by the Pope invested with the sovereignty of Naples and Sicily.

The daughter of the bastard and usurper Manfred, being married to Peter III. of Aragon, entailed on Sicily the disputes and misfortunes which her father had opened there; for by this pretended right to Sicily, conveyed through Constance, daughter of Manfred, to the Princes of Aragon, the successors of Charles of Anjou were in perpetual war with the Aragonians, till, in the year 1282, the Sicilians acted that bloody tragedy called the Sicilian Vespers, in which every Frenchman in the island was massacred in one night. After this massacre the possession of the island fell into the hands of the Spaniards, who from that time to the Treaty of Utrecht governed it by viceroys. At the Treaty of Utrecht in 1713 it was given with the title of King to the Duke of Savoy, who was crowned at

Palermo, but kept the possession of Sicily only five years. 1734 Philip V., the present King of Spain, who had yielded this island with reluctance by treaty, tried in the year 1718 to regain it by force. How he was prevented from making himself master of it by the English fleet, and why and how it was given to the Emperor, is already related in these papers.

The Germans from that time to this have behaved themselves there with that insolence, brutality, and avarice, so natural to a proud fierce people, that the Sicilians were not sorry to try again their old masters the Spaniards, bad as they were; and at this moment in which I am now writing Sicily is again the cause and seat of war between the Germans and Spaniards, the one trying to maintain the possession of the island, the other to acquire it.

The rapaciousness and cruelty of all these successive plunderers and tyrants made Sicily miserably sensible that in all the changes of her masters she was never to taste any change in her adversity; and, whatever rotation there was in the fortunes of her oppressors, that there never was to be any in the fate of those they oppressed. Carthaginians, Romans, Vandals, Saracens, French, Spaniards, and Germans, united in demonstrating this melancholy truth; and, how different soever they were in other respects, in this particular at least they all resembled one another.

But to return from the history of the many misfortunes of Sicily to that of the present misfortunes of the Emperor, I must come to relate that His Imperial Majesty's affairs were not under much better management, and met with little better success, in the upper part of Italy than they did in the lower.

The blindness, the infirmity, and incapacity of Count Merci had made the Court of Vienna determine to recall him, and send Count Königsegg in his stead; but whilst Königsegg was on the road Merci resolved to strike a stroke that should either make the Court of Vienna ashamed to disgrace him, or by which he would lose his life as well as his command. In short, he called a council of

1734 war, and determined, against the opinion and remonstrances of all the general officers, to give battle to the army of the allies. Prince Louis of Würtemberg, cousin to the Queen of England, was the only general officer who did not oppose this undertaking, and he rather acquiesced than approved. He had had a long quarrel with Merci ever since his arrival in Italy, was but just reconciled to him, and for fear of being thought desirous, or at least too ready, to open again that new-healed wound, he rather avoided opposition than gave his assent. When others, who were not in the same difficulties of opposing as the Prince of Würtemberg, remonstrated against the weakness of this attempt, enumerated the dangers that must attend such an undertaking, and told Merci it was running his head against a wall, Merci's answer was, "J'aimerais mieux avoir dix livres de plomb à la tête, qu'une livre de chagrin au cœur." When they urged the profusion of blood and waste of lives that this measure would make, he said, "Generals were accountable for their courage and for their fidelity, but not for blood or lives."

When the King told this particular to Lord Hervey, he owned it was very true that the Emperor never looked upon the loss of private soldiers as anything. Lord Hervey said it was well for mankind that the Emperor's way of reasoning was not more general; and that for his part there was not anybody he had not rather be than a prince capable of thinking in that manner, except it was one of his subjects; nor could he comprehend this way of reasoning, which was no more justifiable in point of policy than it was reconcilable with humanity, since in his opinion a king could no more look upon any who lavished the lives of his subjects as fit for a general, than he could esteem one who squandered his revenue proper for a treasurer.

June 29 This battle was fought under the walls of Parma, and from Parma received its name.

Merci made a short speech to his troops before he gave the word to charge, and concluded it with telling them:

"Il faut dîner à Parme ou souper en Paradis." He promised them, too, in case of victory, the plunder of Parma for three days. A man who never read the particular account of a battle without being tired of it must be so improper an author to relate one, that I shall say nothing more of this than that it began at nine in the morning and lasted till it was dark; that it was fought across a narrow canal with great fury and great slaughter on both sides; and that the army of the allies was reckoned to have gained a complete victory, though they had no other advantage from it than the remaining masters of the field of battle. The loss of the allies was computed to be about 7,000 men and 700 officers; that of the Germans about the same number with the death of their general, Count Merci, who ordered himself to be carried into the thickest ranks and where the engagement was hottest, and seemed to have no other design in giving this order than gracing his exit with the slaughter of those whose lives had been committed to his care. 1734

The disordered precipitate retreat of the Imperialists after the battle made their defeat deserve that name more than the number of men they lost. They left all the wounded as well as the dead upon the field of battle, and crossed four rivers in their haste to run from the enemy before they stopped, and left 500 men behind them in Guastalla, who were all made prisoners of war in a few days after. The leaving the wounded on the spot to take care of themselves, it seems, is the common humane manner of the Austrians in victory as well as in defeat; and the compassionate, just reason they give for it is the bad economy there would be in giving more money to cure a sick man than is necessary to buy a well one.

The army of the allies was commanded in this action by Monsieur de Coigny, and under him Monsieur de Broglio, the same who was formerly Ambassador from France at the Court of England. Both these Generals had been just made Marshals of France upon the death of Marshal Villars, who, upon a constant misunderstanding

1734 and perpetual squabbles with the King of Sardinia, had been recalled from his command of the army, and died
June 21 on his return home at Turin. He died sole Marshal of France, the Duke of Berwick having been killed a few days before in the trenches at the siege of Philipsburg. When the news of the Duke of Berwick's death by a cannon-ball was brought to Marshal Villars (then dying a lingering death of fever, chagrin, and of a bloody flux), he said: "Monsieur de Berwick étoit toujours heureux; il l'est autant dans sa mort qu'il l'étoit dans sa vie."

Though public rejoicings were ordered throughout all France for this victory in Italy, yet it cost the lives of so many people of condition that half Paris at this season was in private mourning; all the old women weeping their husbands or their sons, and all the young ones a father, a lover, or a brother.

The King of Sardinia was not present at the battle. The Queen, who died a few months after, was then ill and he, not expecting any immediate action, came thither to make her a visit, and returned to the camp the day after the action.

The conduct of Count Merci on this occasion was condemned by everybody except the Emperor, who naturally, one might have imagined, would have condemned it most. But when His Imperial Majesty heard his courtiers censuring his behaviour as rash and injudicious, he very unexpectedly and roughly cut them short by saying, "Les morts, Messieurs, ont toujours tort."

Monsieur de Königsegg, at his arrival in Italy, found the Imperial army in the most miserable condition, and near 17,000 men wanting to complete the number of which it consisted when the Germans took the field at the beginning of the campaign.

It was remarkable that he found these two armies just in the same situation in which they had been in 1703, when he served under Marshal Starhemberg, and the Duke of Vendôme commanded the French, who were then,

as now, just going to besiege Mirandola. Not long after 1734
Monsieur de Königsegg took the command of the Imperial army, the Germans again gave battle to the allies. The army of the allies was encamped in two separate bodies, and on different sides of a small river called the Secchia. That body of troops which was encamped the nearest to the Imperial army consisted of [25 or 30] battalions under the command of Marshal Broglio, whom Monsieur de Königsegg one night surprised in his quarters and entirely defeated, killing many of his men, taking many prisoners, and putting the rest to the most confused flight. Their whole baggage, amounting to a great value, was the booty of the German soldiers, who, like the rest of their countrymen, never slip any occasion to lay hold of any seizable half-crown. This was, as some think, the occasion of the army of the allies not being entirely routed; for many were of opinion that, had the Imperialists, immediately after this action, attacked the other part of the camp of the allies whilst the great consternation spread throughout the troops by this blow was fresh and unrecovered, they might have safely cut off the whole of the enemy; but whilst the German soldiers were plundering, and the Austrian General deliberating, three days elapsed, and the attack was made too late on a recovered and entrenched enemy. This battle, called the Battle of Guastalla, was fought with great bravery and great slaughter on both sides. In these two actions, between which there was, as I have said, only the space of three days, many officers of distinction were killed in both armies, and about 8,000 men on each side. Sept. 14

The Marshal Broglio's disgrace for having been surprised in his quarters, and losing, for want of common guard and watch, all the men committed to his care, was not only the subject of every Gazette in Europe, but the topic of every conversation, and the burden of ten thousand ballads that were sung in all Paris and all France to ridicule his negligent conduct and his extraordinary

1734 flight, which was made in his shirt upon a cart-horse, his breeches in his hand, and his two sons riding before him. He was fast asleep when a sentinel at the door of his tent first came in to tell him the Germans were in his camp; and he had just time to make his escape in the manner which I have described. It was said that, whilst he was in the stable in his shirt bridling his cart-horse, he was seized as a prisoner by one of the German soldiers, who knew him not, nor in the least imagined this prize to be a Marshal of France. The Marshal told the German trooper he was an undercook in Monsieur de Broglio's kitchen, not worth his care, and begged his release; upon which the trooper gave him a kick on his naked posterior and saying, "Va-t'en, bougre," let him escape.

The Marshal de Broglio's situation on this occasion was just that of Cerialis, thus described by Tacitus: "*Dux semisomnus, ac prope intectus, errore hostium servatur, et quamquam periculum captivitatis evasisset, infamiam non vitavit*:"—"The General, half asleep and almost naked, by the error of the enemy escaped; but though he avoided the danger of being made a captive, he could not wipe off the infamy of having by his own negligence incurred it."

Thus went affairs in Italy. I must now go back to the opening of the campaign on the Rhine, when Marshal Berwick divided his army, which consisted of above 100,000 men, into two bodies, with one of which he besieged Philipsburg, and with the other (which was strongly entrenched) he covered the besieging army.

As soon as the auxiliaries joined Prince Eugene, the first of which were 6,000 Hanoverians, he marched towards Philipsburg with his whole army, which now, with the Hanoverians, the Danes, the Prussians, the Suabians, the Franconians, and other quotas furnished by the Princes and Circles of the Empire, amounted nominally to about 80,000 men. Both armies continued for some weeks within musket-shot of each other, during which time all

Europe expected every day to hear they were engaged in a general battle, and the whole world seemed to agree it was impossible they should separate without an action, whoever moved first running the risk of being cut in pieces. When Marshal Berwick's head was shot off by a random shot in the trenches, it was concluded that Prince Eugene would take advantage of the consternation which the loss of a general always occasions in an army to attack the French camp; but whether he found it too strongly entrenched to venture such an undertaking, or thought the Emperor's affairs in such a situation that hazarding a battle at the gate of Germany was playing too deep, I know not. Whatever his motive was, it is certain he remained in inaction, and had the mortification of being forced to suffer Philipsburg to be taken in his sight, though he had promised the Governor to relieve him. 1734

I know the French did not expect to have carried their point with so little resistance, Monsieur Chavigny, a little before the town surrendered, having shown me a letter from Monsieur de Belleisle (who formerly commanded the siege of Strasburg), in which I remember these words: "Une mollesse surprenante règne par tout dans les troupes Impériales, mais nous ne pouvons pas espérer que cette mollesse puisse se repandre à un tel point que Monsieur le Prince Eugène nous verra prendre Philipsbourg, les bras croisés."

On the death of the Duke of Berwick, Monsieur d'Asfeldt and Monsieur de Noailles were created Marshals of France, and the principal command of the army on the Rhine (where they both were) was given to the former.

Monsieur Witgenau, Governor of Philipsburg, behaved extremely well, but the garrison infamously ill, there being near 4,000 men in the place, with ammunition and provisions sufficient to have held out a month longer, when the garrison obliged the Governor to surrender, and refused to strike another stroke to defend the town, though July 18

1734 the walls of the main body of the place were still entire, and nothing but the horn and crown works and out-fortifications yet taken.

The besiegers were so inconvenienced by the overflows of the Rhine, so afflicted by sickness, and so distressed by the scarcity of provisions, that the French said, notwithstanding the fortitude and resolution with which the troops behaved, in case the town had held out a week longer, they must have raised the siege.

When the Prince of Conti complimented the Governor after the capitulation, as he was marching out of the town, upon the brave defence he had made, the Governor said, with great civility to his enemies and great indignation against his own men, that had he had Frenchmen to command, the town had been yet untaken.

The night the news came to England that Philipsburg was taken, the Princess Royal, as Lord Hervey was leading her to her own apartment after the drawing-room, shrugged up her shoulders and said, "Was there ever anything so unaccountable as the temper of papa? He has been snapping and snubbing every mortal for this week, because he began to think Philipsburg would be taken; and this very day that he hears it actually is taken he is in as good humour as ever I saw him in my life. Mais, pour vous dire la vérité, je trouve cela si bizarre, et (entre nous) si sot, que j'enrage de sa bonne humeur encore plus que je ne faisois de sa mauvaise." "Perhaps," answered Lord Hervey, "he may be about Philipsburg as David was about the child, who, whilst it was sick, fasted, lay upon the earth, and covered himself with ashes; but, the moment it was dead, got up, shaved his beard, and drank wine." "It may be like David" (replied the Princess Royal), "but I am sure it is not like Solomon."

It was reported at this time that the Emperor, notwithstanding all the disadvantages under which Prince Eugene must have forced the French to an engagement before Philipsburg, blamed him for not doing it; there being at

that time a strong faction against Prince Eugene at Vienna, 1734 and this being the way of reasoning with which they had possessed the Emperor: that in case the Imperialists could beat the French, they might march into France and do what they pleased; and in case they were beaten, that the maritime powers, who as yet remained neuter, would be obliged to take part in his quarrel. In Prince Eugene's camp there were, besides several other great princes, the King of Prussia, his eldest son, and the Prince of Orange. When the last went thither the Princess Royal had returned to England.

After the surrender of Philipsburg, the French and the Imperialists, notwithstanding the impossibility insisted on by all mankind of their parting without blows, separated very quietly by a mutual retreat: so easy is it in any situation for two great armies to find means either to fight or let it alone, when each antagonist wills the same thing. The sickness that raged in the French camp, and the fatigue the troops had undergone during the siege, made them in all probability ready enough to decline a general battle; and their army being able, besides the strength of their entrenchments before, to fortify themselves now behind, by retiring under the cannon of Philipsburg, made the disadvantage on which Prince Eugene must have attacked them too great for him to undertake it. The same policy too that made the Court of Vienna desire a battle might perhaps induce the Court of France to avoid it; the latter fearing perhaps as much as the first wished to bring things to such an extremity as should oblige England and Holland to take part in this squabble, further than by their pacific good offices to compose it.

Nor was it wonderful that Prince Eugene should be slow to take any hints given him from his Court to pursue more violent and more hazardous measures; since nothing could be more natural than for a man of his age and character to fear bringing the one into disgrace, and throwing any shade over the lustre of the other.

1734 Whilst these things were doing on the Rhine, I must now relate how matters were carried on in the North. King Stanislaus, with the Primate, and Monti, the French Ambassador, were retired to Dantzic, received by the magistrates of that place, and shut up there by the Russians, who, after burning, pillaging, and laying waste every town and field in Poland, marched to Dantzic under the command of their general, Count Munich, summoned the Dantzigers to surrender the town and give up Stanislaus, and, upon their refusal, formed the siege of that place.

The Dantzigers, having taken money from France to receive Stanislaus, and expecting succours from thence every hour to relieve them, stood the siege with great firmness, bravery, and resolution, while the attack was formed, and the defence made, with equal vigour on both sides.

The Elector of Saxony, in the meantime, choosing, whilst the Muscovites marched to Dantzic, rather to be fought for than to fight, took a short turn, and to the astonishment of all Europe, left the Russian army just at this juncture, and went to Dresden to settle the affairs of his electorate, which, as he pretended, required his immediate presence.

This happening to be the season too for the fair of Leipzig, and his presence being equally necessary there, His Electoral Highness took this opportunity to go and partake of those recreations, and, whilst the Russians were cannonading and bombarding Dantzic in his cause, he was diverting himself with seeing harlequinades and rope-dancers, and buying snuff-boxes and toothpick-cases for the Polish ladies at the fair. By which means, the worthy cause of all this strife, who had first, like a fool, drawn himself into this quarrel when he should have kept out of it, now, like a coward, drew himself out of it when he ought to have kept in it, and acted as much contrary to his honour in not endeavouring, when he was embarked,

to maintain the crown of Poland, as he had acted contrary 1734 to his interest in ever attempting to acquire it.

When one sees the blood of brave and honest fellows shed, and hears of the lives of thousands devoted to the foolish glory and mistaken interest of such princely idols, even in this enlightened age of the world, how can one be surprised if superstition and bigotry in the earlier and darker ages of it could induce Egyptian fathers to sacrifice their sons to onions and monkeys? or how can one have a greater reverence for those who are so stupidly loyal than for those who were so ignorantly pious?

I cannot here pass over in silence a very gallant action of Count Plélo, a man bred in camps, but now ambassador from France at the Court of Denmark. A miserable little succour of about 1,800 men was sent by France to throw themselves, if they could, into Dantzic; they attempted it, were repulsed, and, as Count Plélo thought, with too little resistance; he therefore undertook to rally them, put himself at their head, and marched first, showed them the way to the only open entrance into the town, and endeavoured to animate them by words as well as example. But whilst he was exciting them to face and brave the dangers that opposed this attempt of entering the town, by perpetually crying out "*Avancez! avancez!*" he was slain by several wounds, which it is generally thought he received not from the enemy, but from his own followers, who were instigated, as it was conjectured, to this infamous act by some of their superiors, who had been piqued at the reproaches of Count Plélo, and grudged him the chance of gaining that reputation in renewing this attempt, which they had lost by giving it up.

When the King of England related this history of Count Plélo to his courtiers at Richmond, he said, with tears in his eyes, "It was a brave action; he was a fine fellow. I think a prince too happy who has such servants." He to whom His Majesty addressed this discourse replied, "I think, Sir, those subjects still more happy who are governed

1734 by a prince that deserves such servants." The King loved heroism and flattery both so well, that he seemed almost as much pleased with the answer as with the action.

Soon after this adventure, the fort of Weichselmünde, that commands the mouth of the Vistula, on which Dantzic is situated, being taken by the Muscovites, all communication with the town from the sea (which was the only communication it had long had) was cut off, and Dantzic at last, after a brave and obstinate defence, was obliged to capitulate.

The night before the *chamade* was beat, Stanislaus made his escape to Königsberg in the habit of a peasant, and attended by only one *valet de chambre*, leaving behind him a letter of thanks to the magistrates for the favours he had received at their hands, and declaring in the most pathetic terms the concern with which he found himself obliged to desert those whom no hardships, no fears, and no threats, had been able to prevail with to abandon him.

The conditions on which the Russian General obliged the Dantzigers to surrender were very severe, with regard to the vast sum he forced them to pay towards the expenses of the war, and all of them were constrained to acknowledge King Augustus, and to take an oath of allegiance to him as their lawful sovereign.

The Primate alone refused to take the oath, and was for this refusal sent close prisoner to Elbing, and afterwards to Thorn, where he persisted, unterrified by threats and unallured by promises, in constant fidelity to King Stanislaus. His behaviour was great, and his conduct uniform. Monti was also confined with the Primate, contrary, as the French alleged, to the law of nations, and in violation of the sacred title of ambassador. The Russians excused this step by saying that the French had been the aggressors in taking a frigate of theirs without any previous declaration of war; and by Monti's acting in opposition to them.

Whilst the arms of France were thus employed in Italy

and on the Rhine, and thus unemployed at Dantzic, there 1734
were great murmurs throughout all that kingdom against
the Cardinal's conduct, and great fault found with the
orders and instructions he had given in every part of the
world where France was concerned.

In the first place he was extremely censured for permitting the Spaniards to separate themselves in Italy from the army of the Allies, and suffering them to go and do their own particular business in seating Don Carlos on the throne of Naples before the common cause was served and the Emperor driven out of the upper part of Italy.

In the next place, his instructions to the generals on the Rhine were no better approved than his passive conduct with regard to the separation of the Spaniards in Italy. Everybody could see and blame the error of not suffering Prince Eugene to be attacked before the auxiliaries joined him, when he had only an army of 22,000 men; and people equally condemned his ordering the useless siege of Philipsburg to be undertaken, instead of this stroke, which, as the French said, would have put them into a condition of making what irruptions they pleased into the empire, or of putting an honourable and immediate end to the war, and making peace with the Emperor on what terms they thought fit.

The Cardinal was likewise reproached with giving up the honour of France in the most essential point by sending no succours to Dantzic. There was nobody in Paris who did not descant on the infamy it brought upon the King to suffer his father-in-law to be so abandoned and exposed; and how little justice or gratitude there was, in permitting those who had so hospitably received and so bravely defended him to be given up to the resentment of the common enemy. They further added, that France must rather incur ridicule than acquire glory by sending her forces, like so many Don Quixotes, to make conquests and gain kingdoms for other princes, whilst the father of their own Queen was hunted out of his; and the chief cause

1734 of the war so ill prosecuted and maintained, that the only point France pretended originally to have in view, or in which she was really concerned, was given up and carried against her.

With regard to Italy, the Cardinal excused himself by saying he had protested against the separation of the Spaniards, but had not been able to prevent it. The Queen of Spain was so bent on that expedition for her son, that his Eminence said there was no middle way for him to take; he was obliged either to consent to the attack of Naples, or to dissolve the triple alliance. As to the neglect of giving battle to Prince Eugene when he was at the head of only 22,000 men, the Cardinal said he had never desired to push this war to extremities, nor to do anything that should look as if the ruin of the empire, or enlarging the dominions of France, was designed; all he desired was to humble the pride of the Court of Vienna and the House of Austria, and to do justice to the insulted honour of his master in maintaining the rights of the King his father-in-law.

This made people say that the scheme of his Eminence then was to put France to the expense of armies without allowing them the liberty to fight; and that, according to this way of reasoning, he was so pacifically and charitably inclined, that he was as much afraid of hurting his enemies as his friends, and more apprehensive of giving too much annoyance to the first than procuring too little benefit to the last.

But most people imagined the Cardinal's reason at this time for acting as he did was (as I have already mentioned) the fear of bearing so hard on the Emperor as might alarm England and Holland, and induce those two powers, who were now mediators for peace, to make themselves parties in the war. It was certainly no oversight in the French councils that prevented Prince Eugene being attacked; the Duke of Berwick having made the proposal to the Cardinal, and the Cardinal, at the same time that he

rejected it, making a merit to the ministers of England 1734 and Holland of his moderation in so doing.

But that which was most of all cried out against was the sending no succours to Dantzic; and as the Cardinal in his justification could not publicly give the real reasons for this seeming negligence and dishonourable omission, he was forced to stand all the irksome reproach of it in a patient and passive silence.

The true state of this case, I believe, was, though France had at this time a fleet of about 40 sail riding in the Channel, ready to convey troops to Dantzic, yet, the English lying at the same time in the Downs in sight of the French coasts, the Cardinal did not dare to leave the shores of France naked, for fear the English, who were then offering their mediation to adjust the disputes of Europe, might have taken that opportunity to oblige France to accept of what terms of accommodation they thought proper, by threatening, in case France refused to comply, to make a descent into their country on the west, whilst all their forces were employed in the east and the south, and their fleet sailed into the north.

Some people imagined that Spain had at present so great an influence on the councils of France, that she insisted on the French fleet continuing where it was to keep the English in awe, and prevent our fleet sailing to the Mediterranean; the Spaniards still remembering the year eighteen, when they had then, as now, a design of invading Sicily, and were defeated in that design by the interposition of Lord Torrington. It was said, the Spaniards feared the same game might be played over again, and therefore pressed France to keep this check upon England at home, that England might be none upon them in the Mediterranean.

This I give only as conjecture, for, whether it was the fears of Spain for the success of their intended expedition to Sicily, or the apprehensions of France in leaving their own coasts defenceless, or both combined, that prevented

1734 the French fleet from sailing to the relief of Dantzic, was never certainly, or at least publicly and generally, known.

During these transactions abroad, the King was in the utmost anxiety at home. The battles of Bitonto and Parma, the surrender of Philipsburg, and the bad situation of the Emperor's affairs in every quarter, gave His Majesty the utmost solicitude to exert himself in the defence of the House of Austria, and to put some stop to the rapid triumphs of the House of Bourbon. For though the King was ready to allow all the personal faults of the Emperor, and was not without resentment for the treatment he himself had met with from the Court of Vienna, yet his hatred to the French was so strong, and his leaning to an Imperial cause so prevalent, that he could not help wishing to distress the one and support the other, in spite of all inferior, collateral, or personal considerations.

In all occurrences he could not help remembering that, as Elector of Hanover, he was a part of the Empire, and the Emperor at the head of it; and these prejudices, operating in every consideration where his interest as King of England ought only to have been weighed, gave his Minister, who consulted only the interest of England, perpetual difficulties to surmount, whenever he was persuading His Majesty to adhere solely to that.

The King's love for armies, his contempt for civil affairs, and the great capacity he thought he possessed for military exploits, inclined him still with greater violence to be meddling, and warped him yet more to the side of war. He used almost daily and hourly, during the beginning of this summer, to be telling Sir Robert Walpole with what eagerness he glowed to pull the laurels from the brows of the French generals, to bind his own temples; that it was with his sword alone he desired to keep the balance of Europe; that war and action were his sole pleasures; that age was coming fast upon him; and that, if he lost the opportunity of this bustle, no other occasion

possibly might offer in which he should be able to distinguish himself, or gather those glories which were now ready at his hand. He could not bear, he said, the thought of growing old in peace, and rusting in the cabinet, whilst other princes were busied in war and shining in the field. But what provoked him most of all, he confessed, was to reflect that, whilst he was only busied in treaties, letters, and despatches, his booby brother, the brutal and cowardly King of Prussia, should pass his time in camps, and in the midst of arms, neither desirous of the glory nor fit for the employment; whilst he, who coveted the one and was turned for the other, was, for cold prudential reasons, debarred the pleasure of indulging his inclination, and deprived of the advantage of showing his abilities. 1734

This was the language he perpetually held, and in this manner was he for ever declaiming to Sir Robert Walpole, whilst all private business and domestic affairs were at a full stand, and no answer to be got from him to the solicitation of any person whatsoever. Whenever Sir Robert Walpole, with the business of twenty different people taken down in abridgment upon his paper of notes, went into the King's closet to speak to him on those heads, the King always began to harangue on the military topic, and, after a declamation of about an hour long, dismissed Sir Robert without one of the things settled on which he came prepared to speak, and often without giving him opportunity barely to mention them.

This conduct bore every way hard upon Sir Robert Walpole; in the first place, as it pressed him so close to come into the measure of war, which he was determined to keep out of; and in the next, as it forced him to find repeated excuses to put people off who were every day teasing him for answers to their solicitations. For, as everybody is anxious in their own case, and all imagined that decision depended entirely on Sir Robert's will, so whatever pains they felt from suspense were placed to his account. The hopes he gave and the promises he made

1734 them were looked upon as ministerial arts to palliate delay, and whatever failed or was postponed from his want of power to prevent it was imputed to him as the effect of negligence or insincerity.

But the circumstance that gave Sir Robert Walpole the most trouble of all was that with regard to the war he found the Queen as unmanageable and opinionated as the King. There are local prejudices in all people's composition, imbibed from the place of their birth, the seat of their education, and the residence of their youth, that are hardly ever quite eradicated, and operate much stronger than those who are influenced by them are apt to imagine; and the Queen, with all her good sense, was actuated by these prejudices in a degree nothing short of that in which they biassed the King. Wherever the interest of Germany and the honour of the Empire were concerned, her thoughts and reasonings were often as German and Imperial as if England had been out of the question; and there were few inconveniences and dangers to which she would not have exposed this country rather than give occasion to its being said that the Empire suffered affronts unretorted, and the House of Austria injuries unrevenged, whilst she, a German by birth, sat upon this throne an idle spectatress, able to assist and not willing to interpose.

Besides her natural propensity to the interest of Germany, she was constantly plied on this side of the question, and warmed as fast as Sir Robert Walpole cooled her, by one Hatolf, the King's sole minister in England for the affairs of his Electorate, a clear-sighted, artful fellow, who was devoted to the interest of Germany and the Court of Vienna, and had more weight with the Queen next to Sir Robert than any man that had access to her. He was a man of great temper, and could reason with decency, and yet was full as hard to be either convinced or persuaded as his master.

The Queen, tired of going between this man and Sir

Robert Walpole to report and interpret, and not being so much mistress of their arguments in detail, made M. Hatolf put his system of politics and his plan for the conduct of England at this juncture into writing. In this paper, though the substance of it was little better than treating England as a province to the Empire, yet he reasoned so artfully and so conformably to the Queen's sentiments and inclination, gave up the interest of this country so plausibly, and argued so strongly for the Emperor on the foot of preserving the balance of Europe, that Sir Robert Walpole told Lord Hervey he never saw any memorial better drawn, or more dexterously calculated, by improving the Queen's partiality and piquing her pride, to carry the point he was labouring to bring about. 1734

Hatolf set forth in the most formidable colours the growing power of France and the House of Bourbon. He said all the reasons that induced this country to engage in King William's and Queen Anne's war ought to operate much stronger now, as France was more powerful and in better circumstances, and that, this nation having so cheerfully come into those wars, he could not conceive why Sir Robert Walpole should imagine people would reason so differently now. He insisted upon it that without help from England the Empire was absolutely at the mercy of France; and though the lenity or indolence of the Cardinal had prevented France from the exertion of her power, yet, as the Cardinal was above fourscore years of age, his life was but a bad tenure for the balance of Europe, and that a more active successor would quickly prove how fatally we had neglected to oppose what might then be too strong for us to stop.

This paper, written in French, the Queen gave to Sir Robert Walpole, ordering him to consider it and give her his answer to it in English. Sir Robert Walpole answered it paragraph by paragraph, and in this answer had an opportunity of methodizing, recapitulating, and enforcing, every argument he had before made use of either to the

1734 King or the Queen to deter them from following their inclination and taking part in this war.

When Sir Robert Walpole gave Lord Hervey an account of these two papers, he said he had at the same time told the Queen that she knew it had been always his opinion ever since this quarrel began in Europe that England ought to have nothing to do with it but to compose it; that if it continued and England took any part in it, her crown would at last as surely come to be fought for as the crown of Poland; and then bade her judge and determine whether the Emperor in justice or in policy ought to receive that support from her that she seemed so desirous to give him.

Lord Hervey approved of everything Sir Robert had written, but still more of what he had said, and told him his last argument, in his opinion, was much the most likely to prevail; for, notwithstanding her partiality to the Empire, if he knew anything of Her Majesty, "the shadow of the Pretender will beat the whole Germanic body."

Sir Robert said it was true, and that he had always recourse to that argument whenever he found his others make less impression than he wished. This great minister, besides the interest of England (which I think he had sincerely at heart), was induced by some personal considerations to stick firm to the point of keeping this nation out of the war if possible. In the first place, to avoid the unpopularity of advising war and creating new clamour against his Administration; in the next, he knew the ungrateful task of raising money to support war would all fall to his share, and added to this, I believe he was not without apprehension that more military business might throw the power he now possessed into the hands of military men. Whatever his reasons and motives were, it is certain he was always counsel on the side of peace; and though he pleaded that cause singly against the King, the Queen, and all about them, hitherto he carried his point and kept things quiet. The Duke of Newcastle, who

always talked as his master talked, echoed back all the big words His Majesty uttered, and expatiated for ever on regaining Italy for the Emperor, chastising Spain, and humbling the impertinent pride of France. His Grace's predominant sensation was fear; and though the moment the war had been declared all the difficulties pendant to that measure would have kept him in incessant panics, yet, the fear of contradicting the King being the present fear, and the present fear in all weak minds getting the better of every other, he promoted that from timidity which, had he had foresight sufficient to discern consequences, the same motive would have made him the first to oppose.

The Duke of Grafton, who loved making his court as well as the Duke of Newcastle, talked in the same strain and for the same reasons, but could never make any great compliment to the King and Queen of embracing their opinion, as he never understood things enough to have one of his own to sacrifice, and was rather obliged to them for giving him the appearance of an opinion, when without that assistance he would have been as much at a loss what to say as what to think.

Lord Grantham was a degree still lower, and had the animal gift of reasoning in so small a proportion that his existence was barely distinguished from a vegetable. His Lordship never got further upon this chapter than to declare and often to repeat, in very bad English, "I hate the French, and I hope as we shall beat the French." Mr. Poyntz, Governor to the Duke, a man of learning, of sense, and of reputation, was another who helped to strengthen Her Majesty in this way of thinking; but whether he spoke his opinion or only aimed at making his court I know not. Sir Robert Walpole thought the first, I thought the last.

Lord Harrington, who with all his seeming phlegm was as tenacious of an opinion when his indolence would suffer him to form one as any man living, leaned strongly to the

1734 side of war; but his credit at Court ran very low, and little deference was ever paid to his sentiments either by the King or Queen but when they tallied with their own, and in that case Their Majesties would sometimes seem to do what I fear is too common with all mankind, which is to flatter ourselves that we show some regard to the judgment of others, when in reality we only pay it to the rebound of our own.

Lord Harrington's understanding had very odd luck in the world, for it was as much underrated after he came to be Secretary of State as it had been overrated before. The public seemed to be stating a sort of account debtor and creditor to his capacity, and to be determined to take from it now in the same proportion that it had added to it formerly. His parts in reality were of the common run of mankind. He was well bred, a man of honour, and fortunate, loved pleasure, and was infinitely lazy. The Queen once in speaking of him said, "There is a heavy insipid sloth in that man that puts me out of all patience. He must have six hours to dress, six more to dine, six more for his mistress, and six more to sleep, and there, for a minister, are the four-and-twenty admirably well disposed of; and if now and then he borrows six of those hours to do anything relating to his office, it is for something that might be done in six minutes and ought to have been done six days before."

Horace Walpole was, for the reasons I have before mentioned, as much for war as his brother was against it, and was as busy in Holland to make the Dutch act against their interest as he was ready at home to sacrifice ours; but happily for this country he succeeded no better than he judged.

It is no great matter what posterity thinks or says of one, but if it were I would pay less deference to truth and more to my own reputation in the characters I give of people, since no one who did not live in these times will, I dare say, believe but some of those I describe in these papers

must have had some hard features and deformities exaggerated and heightened by the malice and ill-nature of the painter who drew them. Others perhaps will say at least no painter is obliged to draw every wart or wen or hump-back in its full proportion, and that I might have softened these blemishes where I found them. But I am determined to report everything just as it is, or at least just as it appears to me; and those who have a curiosity to see courts and courtiers dissected must bear with the dirt they find in laying open such minds with as little nicety and as much patience as in a dissection of their bodies, if they wanted to see that operation, they must submit to the stench.

Count Kinski, the Emperor's Ambassador at this Court (who possessed the two Imperial characteristics of dullness and pride in the supreme degree), notwithstanding the distress his master's affairs were in, was as refractory when anything was asked of him, and as peremptory when he demanded anything of anybody else, as he could have been had the Emperor gained as many victories as he had suffered defeats. The Queen, as he was riding by her chaise one day at a stag-chase, reproached him with this stiffness, and said people when they wanted anything mightily should only think of the means to obtain it. This was said with regard to the haughty and impertinent manner in which the Emperor asked, or rather expected, at this time the assistance of the Dutch. "If a handkerchief lay before me," said the Queen, "and I felt I had a dirty nose, my good Count Kinski, do you think I should beckon the handkerchief to come to me, or stoop to take it up?"

Kinski was at this time so exasperated against Sir Robert Walpole, to whose counsels and power he thought it was owing that the Emperor was unassisted, that he would hardly pay him the common civility of a bow; and every letter that he wrote to Vienna that was intercepted by the Government here was found as full of invectives against Sir Robert Walpole's conduct as any of the *Craftsmen*.

1734 The reason of this was that the King, loving to make a figure to others by adopting those things for his own that had been said to him with weight, used to talk of the Emperor's absurd conduct to Kinski in the drawing-room in German, in the very same strain that Sir Robert had talked of it to him in English in the closet; and this being a style so very different from the language the King had held some months ago, Kinski had just sense enough to discern who must have wrought this change, and abused Sir Robert for it as violently as he hated him. This made Sir Robert odious at Vienna, but it had so little effect here that by the latter end of this summer Sir Robert had brought the King so much into his way of thinking that the King one day said to him: "I have followed your advice, Walpole, in keeping quiet, contrary often to my own opinion, and sometimes I have thought contrary even to my honour; but I am convinced you advised me well. The overtures of friendship that are now made to me by every party in this formidable alliance, and the solicitations I receive from all quarters to mediate in the present disputes, show me plainly that hitherto we are right, and I acknowledge it is all entirely owing to your judgment and prudence that we are so."

Whether this was said quite so strongly as I relate it I doubt, it being so very unlike the King's style on other occasions; but I relate it literally as Sir Robert Walpole related it to me.

Lord Hervey was this summer in greater favour with the Queen, and consequently with the King, than ever; they told him everything, and talked of everything before him. The Queen sent for him every morning as soon as the King went from her, and kept him, while she breakfasted, till the King returned, which was generally an hour and a half at least. By her interest, too, she got the King to add a thousand pounds a year to his salary, which was a new subject for complaint to the Prince. She gave him a hunter, and on hunting-days he never stirred from her

chaise. She called him always her "child, her pupil, and her charge"; used to tell him perpetually that his being so impertinent and daring to contradict her so continually, was owing to his knowing she could not live without him; and often said, "It is well I am so old, or I should be talked of for this creature."

Lord Hervey made prodigious court to her, and really loved and admired her. He gave up his sole time to her disposal; and always told her he devoted it in winter to her business, and in summer to her amusement. But in the great debate at present on the affairs of Europe, and the part this country ought to act with regard to peace and war, Lord Hervey differed with Her Majesty in opinion *to so calo*; and, in speaking that opinion to her too freely, often met with very short and very rough answers. One hunting-day, particularly, he found the Queen, after a long dispute on this subject by the side of her chaise, so much dissatisfied with his persisting to combat her opinion, that as soon as he came home he wrote the following paper, and gave it her at night as she rose from play, after having previously insisted on her promising not to show it to anybody whatever.

MADAM,

I cannot help beginning this paper with complaining that Your Majesty forces me to speak on the topic you introduced this morning on purpose to hear my sentiments and what I can allege in support of them and then are angry with me for declaring them or urging anything in their justification; and did I, like most courtiers, manage your favour more than I consult your interest, I should perhaps, like them, run as little risk of losing the one, and be as little faithful to the other, but chime in with everything Your Majesty says, and never let you know the objections that would be made to any measure you had a mind to take till it was too late to alter it. But for following a contrary conduct, and telling Your Majesty what is and will be said to combat your inclination in this point, Your Majesty treats me as you would one of the most determined Jacobites in the Opposition, who was only saying those things to thwart your will and to distress your affairs in Parliament. That

1734 which hurts me most upon this occasion is that when I feel I wish nothing so much as to promote Your Majesty's pleasure, and to contribute all in my small power to the security and prosperity of your Government, I am always answered as if I was arguing against both, and as if I was pleading for the interest of England in opposition to Your Majesty's; when in reality I use the terms of your interest and the interest of England indifferently, and as synonymous, and look upon them, not only in this question but in all others, as insuperably blended and united.

If Your Majesty was never to be told what would be urged in objection to any measure you had a mind to take, how could you be provided with answers to such objections? and if those objections are of real weight, do those serve you best who, to avoid your displeasure, suffer them to be made by your enemies, too late for you to profit by them, or those who venture to incur your displeasure by representing them whilst it is yet in your power to avoid being exposed to them? Would Your Majesty choose to hear an objection to a measure you have taken from the lips of those who wish ill to your Government, when it must come as a reproach; or from the mouth of those who wish well to all your measures, and when that objection may come time enough to be a warning? In my situation it is impossible for me to have any interest separate from that of Your Majesty and your family; and, besides being the weakest of mankind if I thought I had, I must be also the most ungrateful, considering all the distinctions you honour me with, and the obligations you are daily heaping upon me, if my duty to Your Majesty was not always the first consideration in my thoughts.

This is a very long preface to the business I proposed to treat of in this paper, but Your Majesty will, I hope, have some indulgence to my gratifying the earnest desire I feel to set my real motives for all I ever say on this subject in a true light; and whatever you find in this paper which you dislike or disapprove, I beg Your Majesty would impute to the error of my judgment, not my want of affection, and correct the imperfections of the one without punishing me as you would do, and as I should deserve, if there were any deficiency in the other. I know the whole plan of my conduct since Your Majesty has allowed me the honour of being near you has been to please and serve you; and I must have very ill luck if that penetration which makes you know so well the characters of all about you, permits you so far to mistake mine as to doubt one moment of this truth. But to come at last to the political point on which I have the misfortune to differ from Your Majesty, I own my great and short

maxim with regard to peace and war for this country is that we can never be gainers at the end of a war; and that we are always, whilst it lasts, both actual losers by the expense of it and negative losers by the suspense of our trade, which is so much the vital breath of this nation that the one cannot subsist whenever the other is long stopped. The best exit, therefore, England can ever hope to make at the end of a war is to conclude it in as good a situation as she began it. But notwithstanding this general rule, I do not say it is such a one as is never to be departed from. The question therefore at present is whether this is one of those occasions in which this rule ought to operate or no? Your Majesty says it ought not; and the reason you give for it is "the balance of power in Europe, which England ought always to keep, because sooner or later England must feel the effects of that balance being broken."

In answer to this, I cannot help saying that it was often, and sometimes I think not quite justly, objected to the conduct of some ministers in the late reign, that we were generally so much in haste to be meddling with every little dispute upon the Continent, that we frequently, instead of holding the balance of Europe, were jumping ourselves into the scale, and becoming parties where we ought only to have been umpires.

As to the present dispute, I have often told Your Majesty, and have often been reproved for it without being yet convinced, that I cannot see it is of any great importance to England in particular, or to the balance of Europe in general, whether Italy be in the hands of the Emperor or not. If the dispute lay merely between the Houses of Austria and Bourbon, Naples and Sicily being taken from the Emperor and given to Don Carlos would certainly make a considerable variation in the balance of grandeur in those two families; but as it is the power of France and the power of the Emperor which it is our business to preponderate, so I own I look upon this change of the dominion of Italy as very immaterial, in the first place, as it is no acquisition to France, and in the next, as I think it very disputable whether it be any loss to the Emperor. The possession of Italy enabled the Emperor to enrich a Viceroy of Naples and a Governor of Milan, but he got little or nothing by it himself; and the occurrences of this year have shown that the money he raised on these countries was not sufficient to pay for their defence and defray the charge of keeping forces enough on foot to maintain the possession of them. Would it then be advisable, if this be the case, to engage this nation in a war (the bent of the people and the immediate interests of the nation being against it) only to regain Italy for the Emperor,

1734 and merely to satisfy the pride of a man who has made that quality so often troublesome to your kingdoms, Madam, and your family?

I grant there is a national hatred among the people of England to France; but personal hatreds are always stronger than national enmities, and it is impossible to imagine any foreign prince can be more universally hated in this country than the Emperor is at present. His behaviour with regard to the Ostend Company, and in the first Treaty of Vienna, and indeed the whole series of his conduct towards England since the last war to this hour, has been the occasion of implanting these seeds of dislike, and of their taking such deep root.

The people of England think he has infinite obligations to them, and they infinite disobligations to him; they talk of him in every coffee-house as the proudest, the weakest, and most ungrateful of mankind; and, with the scars of the last war still marked upon us in a debt of fifty millions, it would, in my opinion, be very difficult, if not impossible, to persuade this nation to open new wounds that should leave the marks of fifty millions more, only to pleasure a prince on whom they would be glad, if they could do it without hurting themselves, to inflict any mortification, or to bring any disgrace.

I will now suppose, for argument's sake, that it is material for the balance of Europe that Italy should be possessed by the Emperor; and were it so, could England engage in a war to regain Italy for the Emperor without Holland?—No. Why?—Because, in the first place, it would in all probability be ineffectual; and, in the next, because it must indisputably throw the trade of all Europe into the hands of Holland, if Holland remained neuter. Can you persuade Holland into the war?—No. Your Majesty says, by Horace's letters of late, you think yes. But is not Horace sanguine in his reports? and will not one of the strongest reasons which induce Your Majesty to wish Holland engaged in a war be one of the strongest in the breast of those who now govern Holland to keep out of it? I mean (to speak very plain) the obligation you think Holland would be under, in case of war, to make a stadtholder. We tell the Dutch ministers, that if we and they put no stop to the progress of the arms of France, and do not prevent the too great reduction of the Emperor's strength, Holland and England will only have the poor comfort of being last ruined. But people in power fear no ruin like the loss of their power; and, consequently, the Dutch ministers will never come into any measure by which they apprehend they must begin with giving up what they would least part with.

If England and Holland do not come into a war, what will be the

consequence? France is weary of a war by which she gets nothing 1734 but the honour of conquering for others; Spain will be glad, by a peace, to secure what they have got by the war; and the Emperor to regain to a daughter what he himself has lost. How will that be done? —By the marriage of an archduchess to Don Carlos. Your Majesty and the King I know are both averse to giving a prince of the House of Bourbon any chance to sit on the Imperial throne. But if you will not or cannot assist the Emperor to regain what he has lost by war, how can you object to his doing the best he can for himself by peace? —and what is it that gives Your Majesty such a reluctance to seeing a prince of that House Emperor? Your Majesty cannot imagine that when he is Emperor the ties of blood will ever hold princes together whom views of interest separate. The Emperor for the time being and the King of France, though they were brothers, could never be friends; mutual jealousies and national interests would get the better of all consanguinity or former personal friendships. It never was, nor ever will be otherwise; and, if I may take the liberty to give an example in your own family, Madam, I would be glad to ask whether Your Majesty would not laugh at anybody that apprehended any bad consequences from the too close union of the King of England and his cousin-german and brother the King of Prussia.

This way of reasoning, I own, Madam, would prevent my being afraid of aggrandizing the House of Bourbon by a marriage of an archduchess with Don Carlos, even if the Emperor, to preserve the indivisibility of his hereditary Austrian dominions, should desire to give him his eldest daughter; and I am very sure there is nothing I should apprehend so much as bringing this country into the calamities of war without the utmost necessity; as putting Your Majesty's Government under the extreme difficulty of finding money to support it—as exposing you to the unpopularity of declaring war—and raising such clamour and discontent in this country, as, joined to the resentment of foreign powers, might bring your own crown at last into dispute, and your present security into danger.

I shall say, Madam, but one thing more on this subject, which is that, though Your Majesty's friends may be divided in their opinion with regard to your entering into this war, your foes are united in theirs; since I do not believe there is one enemy in this country to Your Majesty's person and Government, one man whom disappointment or disobligation has estranged to your interest, or one whom principle or hope of reward has attached to the interest of the Pretender to your crown, who does not secretly wish this measure concluded, and is only silent on the subject at present for fear of

1734 diverting Your Majesty from a step by which they hope to inflame the minds of your subjects, alienate their affections, and perhaps stir them to sedition.

These are the crude, indigested notions of a very zealous and faithful servant, which I have drawn into so great a length that I will not add to that transgression by making any other excuse for them than saying they are the result of a mind constantly active for Your Majesty's service, and the overflowings of a heart warm with duty, gratitude and affection.

The inaccuracy with which this paper is drawn, and the little method observed in laying the substance of it together, sufficiently show how hastily it was written; but I chose rather to give it incorrect and genuine, than better dressed and not original. And though the political tenets of it were so repugnant to the opinion of the Queen, yet the dutiful and affectionate terms in which those tenets were delivered operated so strongly, that she was more taken by the one than irritated by the other; and, after the receipt of this letter, behaved to Lord Hervey rather with added than diminished favour.

There is one thing which I cannot help remarking here, very different from the common style of memoir-writers, and that is, the difficulty and sometimes the impossibility of coming at truth, even for those who have, to all appearance, the best information. For example, in the paper Lord Hervey gave the Queen, he takes notice of her having told him that Horace Walpole's letters gave information of the Dutch not being now so averse to taking part in the war as they had been; and when Lord Hervey told Sir Robert Walpole that he wondered Horace would write in that style, since it must make Sir Robert's part in keeping out of the war more difficult, Sir Robert Walpole utterly denied it, and said, the style of Horace's late despatches was so very different from what the Queen had reported them, that the King but the day before had told Sir Robert Walpole that his brother talked more like the Pensionary of Holland than the Minister of England.

About this time one Wasner, a sensible man, in great 1734 favour with the Emperor, was sent here, without any character, to sound the King and Queen, and to confer with Sir Robert Walpole; in short, to pick up what intelligence he could, and report at Vienna the situation in which he found this country, as well as the disposition he discovered in the Prince, the Minister, or the people, with regard to the part England should act in the present circumstances of Europe.

The King and Queen declined seeing him in private for fear of giving umbrage to Kinski, by the discredit it would bring upon him to have it thought the affairs of the Emperor here were to be transacted by other hands. They therefore corresponded with him privately by messages carried backward and forward by Mr. Poyntz, which gave great disquiet to the Duke of Newcastle, who saw perpetual whispers and secrets going on between the King and Poyntz, and knew not the subject of them. Of this disquiet the Queen (one day whilst the King was speaking to Poyntz in a corner of the drawing-room) took notice to Sir Robert Walpole, and said, smiling, "I beg you see the uneasiness of the Duke of Newcastle at that whispering; if Lord Harrington was alarmed I should not wonder." The latter part of what she said alarmed, I think, Sir Robert Walpole, who did not like a growing interest of this kind, which seemed to be nourished merely from its own root.

Poyntz, as I have said before, differed in opinion, or at least in discourse, from Sir Robert Walpole on the measure of war. However, he reported fairly to the King and Queen that Wasner owned he was so pleased with what Sir Robert Walpole had said to him on this subject, and so much convinced by Sir Robert's reasoning that accommodation was the interest of the Emperor, that he wished his master listened to such counsellors, and could hear Sir Robert Walpole talk on this subject only one hour at Vienna. Wasner (as he told Poyntz) transmitted to the

1734 Emperor everything he had heard Sir Robert Walpole say.

But the Queen, tenacious of her own opinion and impatient to have her will fulfilled, was not at all satisfied with the result of this conference between Wasner and Sir Robert. She proposed Wasner should have persuaded Sir Robert into her measures, and not that Sir Robert should have convinced Wasner of the propriety of his own. When Sir Robert told me this, and complained of the Queen's conduct, he further added, that Her Majesty, finding Wasner more tractable than Kinski, had sent him away, which he said was unfair and below her. But I think in this he did not do the Queen justice; for Wasner (as I told Sir Robert) did, at his first coming here, declare his stay was to be short, and that he was to go, as he now did, from hence to Portugal, to settle some business the Emperor had at that Court.

Soon after Wasner's departure a new engine was played. The Bishop of Namur, under the name of Mr. Mosley, arrived in England from Vienna upon the same errand that Wasner came, but undertaken and executed in a very different manner, Wasner having been chosen by the Emperor as a proper man for such a commission, and the other having offered himself, and solicited an employment to which he was altogether unequal. The real name of the Bishop of Namur was Strickland. He was an Englishman by birth, but born of Roman Catholic parents and educated in that religion abroad. Nobody could say he was a fool without being unacquainted with him or so well acquainted with his profligate manners as to be prejudiced against his understanding; but he had only those sort of parts that put people on many projects, and make them apter to despise difficulties than to get over them.

Notwithstanding his profession, and the great rise he made in it, he had passed his whole life in gluttony, drunkenness, and both male and female debauchery. Nor

was his dissolute conduct confined to one country any 1734 more than to one sex; for, as he had been in most Courts of Europe, so in every one of them he had left the fame of these priestly exploits and gentlemanlike recreations.

In the reign of the late King he came into England, and by the credit he then had amongst the Roman Catholics here, under the pretence of serving them, was of use to the Government by betraying all their counsels; in return for which honest services he got to be nominated by the late King of Poland, at the intercession of the late King of England, for a Cardinal's hat, which nomination he sold to the Emperor for one of his favourites, for a sum of money and the presentation to the Bishopric of Namur.¹

He obtained leave of the Emperor at this time to go into England by telling His Imperial Majesty that the reason why England had not yet engaged in his quarrel was that the ignorance and stupidity of Kinski made him incapable of managing this great negotiation; and, in the next place, that Kinski was so disagreeable to the English Court, that his desiring anything was sufficient alone to make the English Ministers averse to it. To these arguments he added that of his own interest at the Court of England being so good, that with the assistance of his dexterity, which he placed in no mean rank, there were few things he was not capable of bringing about.

The reward he proposed for his services, if he succeeded, was a new nomination to a cardinal's hat, and with these views he came to England, thinking, after he came hither, to impose upon our Ministers by bragging of his interest

¹See Michael, II, 121-9, for an account of Strickland's activities in 1718-9 in promoting a plan for a concordat between the British Government and the English Catholics. During these negotiations, which were unsuccessful, Strickland acted as the unofficial agent of the British Government, to whom he was in a position to make himself useful as a non-Jacobite English Catholic Priest, and who in return interested themselves in his ecclesiastical preferment; but apart from Hervey's unsupported and vague assertion there seems to be no ground for suspecting Strickland's bona fides in this matter.

1734 at Vienna, as he had imposed upon the Emperor by boasting of his interest here, in order to be sent hither.

That one single man could hope to play these two Courts in this manner upon one another, at a time that he knew, too, he was obnoxious to the ministers of both, may sound very extraordinary, but it was certainly fact; and his embassy met with the fate that anybody but himself might have expected, and, consequently, nobody but such a coxcomical adventurer in politics would have tempted.

At his first coming over he had an audience of the King that lasted two hours, in which he failed not to set forth, in the most advantageous descriptions, the great favour in which he stood with the Emperor, and the influence he had at present in all the counsels of Vienna; intimating, too, that at his return from this embassy he should immediately be declared First Minister. He told the King at the same time that his affection to his native country, and his gratitude to His Majesty's father and family, would always make him look on the interests of England and His Majesty as what he ought to consider equal to that even of his master; and that he hoped for these reasons the King and the Queen, in answer to the letters he had brought from the Emperor and the Empress, would have the goodness to speak of him as a man not disagreeable to this Court.

The King, as his custom always was upon such occasions, took care to hamper himself by no particular promises, but in general said many civil things to the Bishop, talked at large on the present situation of Europe, and dismissed him from this audience better satisfied with the situation of his affairs than he ever was after.

Sir Robert Walpole, having got the better of Kinski and Wasner, was not for encouraging the growth of these hydras' heads, and therefore resolved to give no assistance, or even countenance, to the Bishop of Namur; and the Bishop, at every conference he had with Sir Robert, finding him not to be shaken in his resolutions against

war, perceived he should certainly fail in the promise he had made the Emperor of bringing England into it. He therefore tried another way, and by caballing underhand with his former friend Mr. Pulteney, and others in the Opposition, endeavoured to distress the Minister as much as the Minister had distressed him. 1734

Sir Robert Walpole, having dogged and traced him to every place he had frequented from his first coming to England, soon found what he drove at, and told the King and Queen he suspected some double game playing by the Emperor, and that the Bishop had been sent here to foment discontents, and form intrigues to disturb the Government, in case he found the Court determined not to enter as rashly into his quarrel as he wished they should.

He had likewise dogged the Bishop (though now near threescore) several times to a little scrub bawdy house, where he used to go late at night on foot and wrapped up in a red rug riding-coat. This he told also to the King and Queen, knowing how useful it is to throw ridicule on those whom one wishes to depreciate, and how serviceable it is in such cases to add contempt to dislike.

At last Sir Robert Walpole got leave to have letters written to Vienna to acquaint the Emperor with the Bishop's clandestine correspondence with the enemies of the Government; to complain of it; and desire, if the Emperor did not mean to countenance such practices, and had given him no authority for taking these steps, that he might be recalled; which he was, by very explicit and peremptory orders from the Emperor, immediately after the receipt of these letters.

Kinski, who had been jealous of the Bishop of Namur from his first arrival here, and hated him heartily, was so pleased with Sir Robert Walpole for not protecting him and getting him recalled, that this incident reconciled them entirely; Kinski, as ignorant people are apt to do, looking on the contingent benefit he drew from Sir Robert Walpole's policy as a favour he received from his friendship.

1734 In this manner finished the embassy of the Bishop of Namur, whose indigested, wild schemes might have been just pardonable errors in a young, hot-headed, enterprising fellow of five-and-twenty, but in a hoary fool of five-and-fifty were altogether inexcusable. A man like him, practised in Courts, and long acquainted with the mysteries of state, as well as of the church, ought to have known that the proficients in the one as well as the other, how easy soever they may find it to deceive their inferiors, never deceive one another.

The only sign of cleverness the Bishop of Namur showed in the whole course of this transaction was in the excuse he made to the Emperor for holding any correspondence with those who were in opposition to the Court. The reason he gave for it was that he found the King and Queen inclined to the war, but overruled by Sir Robert Walpole, whom no arguments or persuasions could shake; if therefore he could have broke Sir Robert Walpole's power, he said, the future Ministers, to whom he had promised the support of the Court of Vienna, he had obliged in return to promise their support to the Emperor in the war. But this availed him little. The Emperor wanted succours and the Bishop a cardinal's hat; and the Bishop, being unable to procure for the Emperor what he desired, was unable to obtain from him what he himself desired.

All this summer the Queen used to see Sir Robert Walpole every Monday evening regularly, and at other times casually; but at every conference she had with him (as he told me), though she always said he had convinced her, and that she would give in to the accommodation, yet day after day, for three weeks together, she made him put off the setting on foot those measures which ought to have been taken in consequence of that conviction. And what is very surprising, yet what I know to be true, the arguments of Sir Robert Walpole, conveyed through the Queen to the King, so wrought upon him, that they quite

changed the colour of His Majesty's sentiments, though ¹⁷³⁴ they did not tinge the channel through which they flowed. When Lord Hervey told Sir Robert he had made this observation, Sir Robert said it was true, and agreed with him how extraordinary it was that she should be either able or willing to repeat what he said with energy and force sufficient to convince another without being convinced herself. However, said Sir Robert Walpole, "I shall carry my point at last; but you, my Lord, are enough acquainted with this Court to know that nothing can be done in it but by degrees; should I tell either the King or the Queen what I propose to bring them to six months hence, I could never succeed. Step by step I can carry them perhaps the road I wish; but if I ever show them at a distance to what end that road leads, they stop short, and all my designs are always defeated. For example, if we cannot make peace and that I can keep this nation out of the war a year longer, I know it is impossible but England must give law to all Europe, yet this I dare not say, since even this consideration would not keep them quiet if they thought peace could not be obtained; and for that reason I graft as yet all my arguments on the supposition that peace will be effected. I told the Queen this morning, 'Madam, there are fifty thousand men slain this year in Europe, and not one Englishman;¹ and besides the satisfaction it is to one's good nature to make this reflection, considering they owe their safety and their lives to those under whose care and protection they are, sure, in point of policy, too, it is no immaterial circumstance to be able to say that, whilst all the rest of Europe has paid their share to this diminution of their common strength, England remains in its full and unimpaired vigour. Your Majesty accuses me always (if I may call it an accusation) of partiality to England, and considering nothing else; but whatever motives of partiality sway me, ought they

¹He used this celebrated remark in the debate described on pp. 412-6 (Carlisle MSS., 150).

1734 not naturally with double weight to bias you, who have so much more at stake?" "

Lord Hervey asked him if these things made no impression upon her? He said, "Yes, for a time; but the partiality she has to her own opinions, or to the gratification of her own will, sometimes even against her opinion, turns her again; and if that bias or her inclination can make her own opinion bend, you cannot wonder, my Lord, if it proves too strong sometimes for mine."

Lord Hervey said, "For your own sake, Sir, I wish the people of England could know the obligations they have to you, and how often you risk the favour that supports you, to employ it, whilst you are possessed of it, for their welfare and advantage; but I own to you, considering the disaffection there is already in the kingdom to those we serve, and how much it is the interest of us all to keep that disaffection from spreading, I had rather, as well as I love you, that you should lose the popularity of being known so to fight the people's cause than have it known at the same time against whom you are obliged to combat. For if we who wish them well, and whose interest and inclination it is to support them, cannot help feeling something within us that recoils on these occasions, what effect must the same reflections have on the minds of those who are so much prejudiced against them as we are prepossessed for them; and would be as glad of a handle to abuse their conduct and blacken their characters as we should be of the means to defend the one or brighten the other!"

I cannot help here making a short digression by way of apology for the frequent use I find myself obliged to make of my own name, notwithstanding all the resolutions I made against it when I undertook this work, the promises with which I set forth to avoid it, and the endeavours which in the progress of it I have often made use of to comply with so decent and proper a rule laid down to myself. In reading the works of other memoir-writers, I own I have frequently been shocked with the same

behaviour; and knowing, by corresponding accounts of the 1734
times they treated of, how much an inferior figure they
made in the picture when drawn by other hands than when
painted by their own, I have imputed to their vanity what
from experience I now find may have been owing to
necessity. For, as authors in these cases must chiefly relate
such transactions as they themselves have had some little
concern in, and for the satisfaction of their readers, even
in facts where they were not concerned, are forced to
introduce their own name to clear up the manner in which
those facts came to be known to them, so it is impossible
but the authors of such writings, let them be ever so
inconsiderable, must, in transmitting things to posterity,
mention themselves much oftener than at first may seem
necessary to the readers, and, consequently, from reasons
very different from those to which the readers may ascribe
them, and from which, considering the universal propen-
sity mankind have to talk of themselves, it may be
very natural for posterity to think such a manner of
writing proceeds.

And since I am entered into apologies for the defects
of this work, I cannot omit making one for the loose,
unmethodized, and often incoherent manner in which it
is put together. This is owing to the little leisure I have
for writing or correcting; the incapacity, consequently,
I am under of recopying my first draughts; and my
setting down day by day the things herein contained, just
as they occur and whilst they are fresh in my memory.
But now my excuse is made, I must add, too, in favour of
this work, that by these means, though the style may be
less pure, the transitions less natural, and the facts less
artfully connected, yet that for which such sort of writings
ought to be most valued, which is fidelity in the recital,
will certainly be better preserved than it could be in any
other way of compiling and transmitting them. By what
I have said I find I have done as people generally do when
they voluntarily confess any fault in themselves, which is

1734 making it a prelude to bragging of some merit which they are more proud of than they are ashamed of the other; hoping at the same time that under the plausible show of ingenuity in the one they may bias their commentators to have a better opinion of their truth in the other.

If I was much concerned for the pleasure people will take in reading these papers when pleasure and pain will be sensations no longer known to me, I should lament, too, the little importance of the occurrences and incidents belonging to the times in which I write and of which I treat. Few readers give great attention but to great events, and such were not the growth of this country in the age I am describing. A minister ruled it who was more anxious to keep his power than to raise his fame, and wisely lived to his present interest, and not to the embellishment of a page in future story; he knew that palliatives, delays, and gentle methods, were the ways to keep power, though active and enterprising steps may sometimes be the means to gain it, and, in imminent dangers, violent remedies necessary to restore it. But this was not his case—"Callistus prioris quoque regie peritus, et potentiam cautis quam acrioribus consiliis tutius haberi" (Tacitus.) He knew, whatever happened, he could be nothing greater than what he was; and, in order to remain in that situation, his great maxim in policy was to keep everything else as undisturbed as he could, to bear with some abuses rather than risk reformatations, and submit to old inconveniences rather than encourage innovations. From these maxims, which in my opinion he sometimes carried too far, he would never lend his assistance nor give the least encouragement to any emendation either of the law or the church, though the expenses and hardships of the first, and the tyranny and injustice of the last in the ecclesiastical courts, were got to an excess wholly unjustifiable and almost insupportable. From this way of reasoning he opposed the inquiry into the South Sea affair, the bill to vacate the infamous sale of Lord Derwentwater's estate, the examina-

tion of the House of Commons into the affairs of the 1734
charitable corporations and the abuses in the gaols, besides
many other crying instances of flagrant injustice and
oppression, which he could not defend, and yet declined
to correct by any extraordinary method, though, in the
ordinary courts of justice, he and all the world knew it
was impossible to come at the offenders, put any stop to
the offences, or give any redress to the injured. One might
with great truth say of Sir Robert Walpole what Tacitus
does of Tiberius,—“*Nihil æquè Tiberium anxium habebat
quàm ne composita turbarentur.*” This apprehension, long
experience and thorough knowledge of this country and
this Government had taught him; and in this way of
thinking, the unsuccessful deviation he had made from it
in the excise scheme had now more than ever confirmed
him. But, how right soever this policy might be in general,
it exposed him to very severe censures in particular cases;
his enemies often asserting, too plausibly, that there was
not a knave in the kingdom who might not reckon upon
his protection and be sure of escaping if parliamentary
inquiry was necessary to convict him.

■ whom then can a history of such times be agreeable
or entertaining, unless it be to such as look into courts and
courtiers, princes and ministers, with such curious eyes
as virtuosos in microscopes examine flies and emmets,
and are pleased with the dissected minute parts of animals,
which in the gross herd they either do not regard or ob-
serve with indifference and contempt?

But to return to my narrative of the transactions of this
summer. Horace Walpole, who had been sent to prepare
the way of the Princess Royal on her first going to Holland,
soon after her arrival there returned to England, ashamed
of all his disappointments, and at the same time boasting
of his success. When he bragged to Lord Hervey how
well he had managed matters, and assured him that the
Dutch would do nothing without us, Lord Hervey, who
had no mind to let Horace believe him his dupe, said: “We

1734 knew that before you went; but will they do anything with us?" To which Horace, under the ministerial refuge of affecting to know more than he would tell, only replied: "That you will see."

How the Princess Royal was received in Holland, or what she did there, is little worthy of any particularising account. She felt, I suppose, as unabated pride generally feels in diminished grandeur; and as she did not care to let down that pride to cajole the people of the country, nor the people of the country care to do anything to gratify it, she neither pleased there nor was pleased. She passed a solitary life, with music and books, and found no consolation for having quitted England but the prospect of soon returning thither.

There was something very remarkable passed in Holland previous to her arrival there, which I forgot before to relate. The governing people in Holland were so apprehensive of an insurrection of the populace on the arrival of the Prince and Princess of Orange at the Hague that they determined to frame some excuse for taking measures to prevent any bustle and yet to impute those measures to some other cause than the true one, which they did not care to own. The reason given was this. They pretended the common people were so possessed with fear upon account of an ancient prophecy foretelling that this year, in the month of May, all the Protestants should be massacred by the Papists, that, in order to prevent disorders consequent to the apprehensions the people were in of the completion of this prophecy, some measures to preserve the peace ought to be taken; whereupon they ordered a strong guard to patrol night and day about the town, who upon the least tumult were to seize every man concerned in it. But, notwithstanding these precautions, the Prince of Orange's coach, when he came to the Hague, was surrounded by a mob of several hundred people; and whilst those at a distance only hallooed out his name with common acclamations and huzzas, some of those who hung

at his coach-doors told him they wished for nothing so much as to see him Stadtholder, and asked him if they should go and pull down or fire the houses of all those who opposed him. The Prince of Orange, knowing the strength of these his partisans not to be equal to their zeal, nor their power to serve him adequate to their good wishes, was forced to reprove them for what he secretly thanked them, and wisely took the turn of seeming solicitous to correct and keep down that spirit which, if it had been more general or less impotent, he would have doubled his endeavours to stimulate and inflame. 1734

Soon after this (as I have before said) the Prince of Orange went to the Rhine, and the Princess Royal returned to England. As soon as she arrived in England she declared herself with child, which she said she had not done in Holland lest it should have been made a pretence for keeping her there.

Horace Walpole, soon after she came over, was again sent this summer to Holland, and now in the character of ambassador. But Mr. Finch, who was at this same time at the Hague in the character of envoy, was so disobliged at this coadjutor being sent thither, that he desired to be recalled, and quitted the King's service; thinking his capacity (which was a very mean one) equal to the most delicate transactions of state, and not comprehending, though it had been as good as he thought it, that yet Sir Robert Walpole, considering the present circumstances of things, might choose rather to confide in his own brother in an affair where the utmost secrecy was required than in a brother to my Lord Winchilsea, and one who was brought into the world by Lord Carteret, owed everything to his favour, and still lived with him in the strictest friendship.

Horace was every way unsuccessful in this embassy. In the first place he went over with a new scheme to bring the Dutch into the war; this miscarried. Then he made a strange, tedious, complicated, injudicious plan of accommodation; that was disapproved, and, after being

1734 discussed here and considered at Paris, was laid aside to the great satisfaction of our King, who told Sir Robert Walpole, "I am glad there is an end of Horace's stuff, which I never thoroughly understood, but what I did understand of it I disliked." Horace then tried his skill upon a more private affair, and wrote to the Princess Royal to tell her all the Dutch who wished well to her and her husband were very uneasy at her staying in England, for fear (though they were told the contrary) that she should intend to lie-in here. He gave it as his humble opinion, too, that the Prince of Orange would take it better if she came over and waited his return from the camp in Holland, than if she stayed in England till he sent for her. And at the end of this well-judged epistle he desired Her Royal Highness to make her own use of this hint without showing his letter to the Queen.

The Princess Royal, who hated the thoughts of returning to Holland, cried the whole morning after receiving this letter, and, as soon as ever she had read it, carried it with red eyes and wet cheeks to her mother. The Queen, who was almost as unwilling to part with her daughter as she was to go, called Horace an officious fool, and wrote to him, half in jest and half in earnest, to bid him mind his politics, not meddle with what he did not understand, and leave the regulation of her daughter's conduct to her own prudence, who knew much better what was proper than he could tell her. She asked him if he thought her daughter had nothing to do but to be crossing the seas for his pleasure, and said she was sure his only reason for giving this fine advice was his being ennuyé in Holland and wanting the Princess to come and play at whist with him.

The King tipped Horace the "puppy" once or twice upon this occasion, and Sir Robert, finding the stumble his brother had made and not being able seriously to take his part, joined in the laugh against him. The imagining that such advice would be welcome to the Princess Royal,

or that she would conceal such a letter from the Queen, 1734
were two suppositions extraordinary even for Horace's judgment to proceed upon. But his itch of meddling and his awkwardness in touching drew him into eternal difficulties and scrapes, out of which his brother's power and dexterity united were oftentimes barely sufficient to extricate him. Horace hated following directions, though they were ever so good, and loved giving them, though they were ever so bad; but with such perverse obstinacy in one case, and such unfortunate impotence in the other, one must wonder at his great rise in the world, though one cannot at the ridiculous figure he made when so unbecomingly exalted. For he was of that class of men to whom court honours and royal favours, instead of lessening contempt, add to it by making the qualities that first procure contempt more conspicuous, and putting them in an eminence that makes ridicule universal; half the world laughing at him from knowing he deserved it, and the other half doing it upon trust, and because it was the fashion.

Nor would Horace take warning from this disgrace he met with upon meddling with the Princess Royal's conduct with regard to her going back immediately to Holland, but would try his skill again upon the same subject; and, as people generally do when they try to mend, only made the rent still wider. That she was to lie-in in Holland was determined; but the dispute was whether at Lewarden or at the Hague. The Princess herself had a mind to the Hague, for convenience, society, and assistance. Horace advised Lewarden; and the wise reason he gave for it was that as the people of Friesland were entirely devoted to the Prince of Orange, and at the Hague there was a strong party against him, so it would be much more just and reasonable to please those who were firm in his interest than those who were divided and but imperfectly so. Whereas I fear, in policy, whatever gratitude may suggest, Princes ought, where people are to be gained, to argue very differently, and bestow their favours rather in bribes

1734 to acquire friends than in rewards to those who are under an incapacity of acting in any other character.

The Prince of Orange himself, M. Duncan his first Minister, and all his best friends, were united in their opinions for the Princess's lying-in at the Hague; and Duncan went so far as to say he supposed Mr. Walpole wanted something of Monsieur * * *¹ (the Prince of Orange's great enemy) to be done for England, which he proposed to buy by sacrificing the Prince of Orange's interest in this point to obtain it.

At last, however, it was settled by the King and Queen, who thought it for the dignity as well as interest of their daughter, that she should lie-in at the Hague; and, notwithstanding Her Royal Highness's reluctance to quit England, the time was now come that made it necessary for her to take that grating resolution. The Prince of Orange, who had already quitted the Imperial camp, and was making a short tour of Germany, sent M. Grovestein (one of the gentlemen of his bedchamber) to England to let the Princess Royal know he should be at the Hague in a fortnight, and ready to receive her. The tears she shed on this occasion were carefully hidden from Grovestein, but flowed in great abundance whenever he was not present.

After a consultation of physicians, midwives, and admirals, about the manner of her voyage, it was determined that she should embark at Harwich, and the yachts were accordingly sent thither to wait for her.

The Queen was most unaffectedly concerned to part with her daughter, and her daughter as unaffectedly concerned to leave England, and exchange the crowds and splendour of this Court for the solitude and obscurity of her own. Lord Hervey was with her in the morning before she set out, the only man (except her favourite, Mr. Schutz) whom she desired to attend her; and, whilst he led her to her coach, she insisted on his writing to her

¹A blank in the original MS

constantly to give her an account how all those hours ¹⁷³⁴ passed in which she used to have her share. She had Handel and his opera so much at heart that even in these distressful moments she spoke as much upon his chapter as any other, and begged Lord Hervey to assist him with the utmost attention. In an hour after she went Lord Hervey was sent for as usual to the Queen, who was really ill, but was thought to say she was so only from a desire to lay the disorder occasioned by the departure of the Princess on some other cause, and was therefore now as little credited when she said she was sick as she had often been when she said she was well. Lord Hervey found her and the Princess Caroline together, drinking chocolate, drowned in tears, and choked with sighs. Whilst they were endeavouring to divert their attention by beginning a conversation with Lord Hervey on indifferent subjects, the gallery door opened, upon which the Queen said, "Is the King here already?" and, Lord Hervey telling her it was the Prince, the Queen, not mistress of herself, and detesting the exchange of the son for the daughter, burst out anew into tears, and cried out, "Oh! my God, this is too much." However, she was soon relieved from this irksome company by the arrival of the King, who, finding this unusual and disagreeable guest in the gallery, broke up the breakfast, and took the Queen out to walk. Whenever the Prince was in a room with the King, it put one in mind of stories one has heard of ghosts that appear to part of the company and are invisible to the rest; and in this manner, wherever the Prince stood, though the King passed him ever so often or ever so near, it always seemed as if the King thought the place the Prince filled a void space.

The Princess Royal, who in her way to Harwich was to lie the first night at Colchester, on her arrival there found letters from the Prince of Orange to let her know he could not be at the Hague by some few days so soon as he intended; and upon the receipt of these letters she took the resolution of going back the next day to Kensington.

1734 The first intelligence the King and Queen had of her designing to return was seeing her actually returned, and entering the room where they were, when they thought her at sea. The Queen received her with a thousand kisses and tears of joy, the King with smiles and open arms; a reception she bragged of afterwards to everybody, and one she was more pleased with from the doubts and anxiety she had felt on the road of its not being so favourable.

This step, indeed, was approved by nobody, and only not censured by the King and Queen. It was thought not very obliging either to the Prince of Orange or the people of Holland, nor very prudent with regard to her own circumstances to double the fatigue of such a journey; the wind, too, when she turned back, was as fair as it could blow; and what increased the condemnation of her conduct was, that the Prince of Orange, hearing of the time she was to set forward, travelled himself night and day to meet her, and was actually at Helvoetsluys expecting her arrival as soon as it was possible for her, had she gone on, to have landed there.

Oct. 29 The day before the birthday the Court removed from Kensington to London, and the Queen, who had long been out of order with a cough and a little lurking fever, notwithstanding she had been twice blooded, grew every hour worse and worse. However, the King lugged her the night she came from Kensington, the first of Farinelli's performances, to the opera, and made her the next day go through all the tiresome ceremonies of drawing-rooms and balls, the fatigues of heats and crowds, and every other disagreeable appurtenance to the celebration of a birthday. There was a strange affectation of an incapacity of being sick that ran through the whole Royal Family, which they carried so far that no one of them was more willing to own any other of the family ill than to acknowledge themselves to be so. I have known the King get out of his bed, choking with a sore throat, and in a high fever, only to dress and have a levee, and in five minutes undress and return to his bed till the

same ridiculous farce of health was to be presented the 1734
next day at the same hour. With all his fondness for the
Queen, he used to make her in the like circumstances
commit the like extravagances, but never with more
danger and uneasiness than at this time. In the morning
drawing-room she found herself so near swooning that
she was forced to send Lord Grantham to the King to beg
he would retire, for that she was unable to stand any
longer. Notwithstanding which, at night he brought her
into still a greater crowd at the ball, and there kept her
till eleven o'clock.

On the birthday, Sir Robert Walpole, who had been ill of
a flying gout for some time, told Lord Hervey he did not
care to go to any of the feasts, and would come and dine
with him, by which means he should be ready with less
trouble to go up to the Queen in the evening, when he
could catch her at leisure.

Sir Robert Walpole used always to go into Norfolk
twice in a year, for ten days in the summer and twenty in
November, and generally set out for his second expedition
the day after the King's birthday. He was to do so now,
and therefore to take his leave this evening of the Queen.
Between six and seven he went up to her from Lord
Hervey's lodgings, and stayed there near two hours. After
inquiring much of the state of her health, and finding it
very indifferent, he entreated her to take care of herself,
and told her: "Madam, your life is of such consequence
to your husband, to your children, to this country, and
indeed to many other countries, that any neglect of your
health is really the greatest immorality you can be guilty
of. When one says these sort of things in general to princes,
I know, Madam, they must sound like flattery; but con-
sider particular circumstances, and Your Majesty will
quickly find what I say to be strictly true. Your Majesty
knows that this country is entirely in your hands, that the
fondness the King has for you, the opinion he has of your
affection, and the regard he has for your judgment, are the

2734 only reins by which it is possible to restrain the natural violences of his temper, or to guide him through any part where he is wanted to go. Should any accident happen to Your Majesty, who can tell into what hands he would fall, who can tell what would become of him, of your children, and of us all? Some woman, Your Majesty knows, would govern him, for the company of men he cannot bear. Who knows who that woman would be, or what she would be? She might be avaricious; she might be profuse; she might be ambitious; she might, instead of extricating him out of many difficulties (like her predecessor), lead him into many, and add those of her own indiscretions to his. Perhaps, from interested views for herself and her own children (if she happened to have any), or from the natural and almost universal hatred that second marriages bear to all the consequences of a first, she might blow up the father against the son, irritate the son against the father, the brothers against one another, and might add to this the ill-treatment and oppression of the sisters, who, with their youth and bloom worn off, without husbands, without fortunes, without friends, and without a mother, might, with all the éclat of their birth and the grandeur of their education, end their lives as much objects of pity as they began them objects of envy. To these divisions in the palace the natural consequences would be divisions in the kingdom; and what the consequences of those would be, it is much more terrible to think of than difficult to foresee."

The Queen wept extremely whilst Sir Robert was speaking to her, and then answered in this manner: "Your partiality to me, my good Sir Robert, makes you see many more advantages in having me, and apprehend many greater dangers from losing me, than are indeed the effects of the one, or than would be the consequences of the other. That the King would marry again, if I died, I believe is sure, and I have often advised him so to do; but his good sense, and his affection for his family, would put a stop to any such attempts as you speak of in a second

wife, or at least would prevent their coming to the height 1734
you describe; and as for his political government, he has
now such a love for you, and so just a value for your ser-
vices, as well as such an opinion of your abilities, that,
were I removed, everything would go on just as it does.
You have saved us from many errors, and this very year
have forced us into safety, whether we would or no,
against our opinion and against our inclination. The King
sees this, and I own it; whilst you have fixed yourself as
strongly in favour by an obstinate and wise contradiction
to your Prince, as ever any other minister did by the
blindest and most servile compliance."

Sir Robert thanked her extremely for all her goodness
and kind thoughts of him: "But you know, Madam," said
he, "I can do nothing without you. Whatever my industry
and watchfulness for your interest and welfare suggest,
it is you must execute. You, Madam, are the sole mover
of this Court; whenever your hand stops, everything must
stand still, and, whenever that spring is changed, the whole
system and every inferior wheel must be changed too. If
I can boast of any success in carrying on the King's affairs,
it is a success, I am very free to own, I never could have
had but by the mediation of Your Majesty; for if I have
had the merit of giving any good advice to the King, all
the merit of making him take it, Madam, is entirely your
own; and so much so that I not only never did do any-
thing without you, but I know I never could; and if this
country have the misfortune to lose Your Majesty, I should
find it as impossible, divested of your assistance, to per-
suade the King into any measure he did not like, as, whilst
we have the happiness of possessing Your Majesty, any
minister would find it to persuade him into a step which
you did not approve."

After this Sir Robert Walpole proposed putting off his
journey, which the Queen insisted he should not do. He
then said he would desire Lord Hervey to give him every
post an exact account of her health, and begged Her

1734 Majesty would order Lord Hervey to send it from her own mouth undisguised.

From the Queen's apartment Sir Robert Walpole returned directly to Lord Hervey's, sent for him from his company into a private room, and there told him everything that had passed above; adding at the same time how uneasy he was at the condition in which he had found the Queen, and was obliged to leave her, coughing incessantly, complaining extremely (which in slight indispositions she never did), her head aching and heavy, her eyes half shut, her cheeks flushed, her pulse quick, her flesh hot, her spirits low, her breathing oppressed, and in short, all the symptoms upon her of a violent and universal disorder.

He told Lord Hervey he had proposed to the Queen to defer his journey into Norfolk, and said, notwithstanding all she said against, that he would stay, did he not think that, in his own state of health, the air and exercise of this expedition was absolutely necessary to fit him for going through the parliamentary fatigues of the winter.

Lord Hervey said he saw no use Sir Robert Walpole could be of to the Queen in her illness, but that he owned he was sorry the foreign affairs were not better settled before his departure. Sir Robert Walpole said: "I am sure there will be no alteration made in them in my absence; the King having given orders for the letter to be sent which is to carry his consent to Don Carlos's marriage with the Archduchess, and the Queen has promised me there shall be no expressions in the letter that can be construed by the Emperor to be any promise of assistance by force from England, in case the mediation of England for peace should prove ineffectual. I convinced her how proper it was to steer clear of such engagements by telling her it would always be time enough to give the Emperor assistance with force, if it should in futurity be thought expedient and advisable so to do; but that there could be no good in making promise of it beforehand, or even in giving

such hints as might make assistance expected; in the first 1734 place, because such hopes might make the Emperor more refractory in schemes proposed for accommodation; and in the next, because they might afford him a handle to reproach England, in case we did not assist him, that it was upon account of the hopes given that we would that he had resolved to run the hazard of another campaign; in which event, whatever losses he sustained, his resentment against those by whom he would say he was drawn in to suffer such misfortunes and disgrace would be full as great as against those by whom they were actually inflicted."

Lord Hervey told him he firmly believed the Queen now intended to do what Sir Robert Walpole had advised. "But consider, Sir," continued he, "how often she has advanced, and how often retreated; consider, too, what effects the opportunity of your absence and the importunity of those who differ from you may have on her mind, and consequently on the King's counsels, when, talking the sentiments of her heart and the dictates of his inclination, they shall try, with such powerful auxiliaries on their side, to efface the impressions you have left upon her reason—impressions made with so much difficulty and received with so much reluctance. You know how often this letter has been ordered, and how often countermanded; how often it has actually been written, and yet not sent, from being conceived in terms either not approved by those who counselled its being written, or by those who were so unwillingly persuaded to order it. You yourself once told me that, when first this scheme of accommodation was proposed, the King said he would rather risk his Crown than suffer a Prince of the House of Bourbon to have any chance to sit on the Imperial Throne. This you got over, and gained his consent. When you had done so, and the Duke of Newcastle had orders to say to the Court of France that the King had consented to the match, you, in order to make this measure seem a little consistent with the language that had been talked to

1734 that Court at the time of the Treaty of Hanover, were forced to dress up this letter with many palliative expressions, pleading the necessity of the times, the alteration of circumstances, the exigency of affairs, and several other particulars that were to reconcile these opposite ways of acting in different seasons, and that looked as if this was a measure to which England was rather forced than inclined. Accordingly, when this letter so drawn was sent to the King, His Majesty, who was not under the same obligations as his Ministers to manage appearances and reconcile this step with that of the Hanover Treaty, sent back the letter to his Grace of Newcastle with no other comment than these words written at the bottom of it: 'I do not like this despatch, and will not have it go.' Upon this the Duke of Newcastle fretted, the King stormed, and you were forced to be quiet; reproached by his Grace, snapped by His Majesty, and your distress laughed at by the Queen, who was glad to see that accidentally postponed which you had worried her into forwarding."

Sir Robert Walpole to this replied, that Lord Hervey went back to a season when the Queen rather yielded than concurred, and acquiesced without being convinced; but he assured him that now she was brought over entirely to his way of thinking: in which opinion he either flattered himself (deceived by the Queen, and the propensity everybody has to believe they convince when they persuade), or he endeavoured to deceive Lord Hervey by saying what he wished, and not what he thought.

During this conference Lord Hervey told Sir Robert Walpole that he feared the King had overheard everything that had passed this evening between him and the Queen. Sir Robert started at this, and said: "If he has, it is impossible he can ever forgive me; but what reason have you, my dear Lord, to think so?" "I will tell you," replied Lord Hervey. "As soon as you left me, having something to say to the Princess Caroline, and knowing she always left

the Queen when you came to her, I went up to her apart- 1734
ment to take that opportunity of speaking to her. Not
finding her there, I went to the Queen's pages, asked of
them where she was, and from them I learned that the
King, with his three eldest daughters, when you came to
the Queen, went into the bedchamber, which you know
is the next room to that where the Queen and you were
together. When I heard this, and reflected on what you
once told me at Kensington of his shutting himself up
in a closet, and leaving the door ajar to listen to a confer-
ence between the Queen and you, I immediately concluded
that from the same curiosity he had now done the same
thing." "For God's sake," said Sir Robert Walpole, "find
out whether it was so or not, and let me know before I set
out to-morrow morning for Norfolk." Accordingly Lord
Hervey, going immediately up to the ball, there told
Princess Caroline that he had been at her apartment this
evening, had not found her at home, and wondered where
she had been; upon which she presently told him, that as
soon as Sir Robert Walpole came to the Queen, the King,
with her and her sisters, went through the Queen's bed-
chamber and the younger Princesses' apartment down to
their governess's lodgings, my Lady Deloraine.

Lord Hervey was not a little pleased to find his con-
jectures had been false, and quickly made Sir Robert
Walpole easy by a short note to tell him what the case had
been. The next day Sir Robert set out for Norfolk, and
soon after the Princess Royal again for Harwich, where I
shall leave her for some time, and return in my narrative
to St. James's.

The interest of Lady Suffolk with the King had been
long declining. His nightly visits all last winter had been
much shorter than they used to be, and not without some-
times a total intermission. His morning walks, too, this
last summer resembled his nightly visits the preceding
winter; and all those who saw them together at the com-
merce-table in the evening in his private apartment plainly

1734 perceived they were so ill together that, when he did not neglect her, the notice he took of her was still a stronger mark of his dislike than his taking none. At Richmond, where the house is small, the walls thin, and what is said in one room may be often overheard in the next, I was told by Lady Bristol, mother to Lord Hervey, the lady of the bedchamber then in waiting, whose apartment was separated from Lady Suffolk's only by a thin wainscot, that she often heard the King talking there in a morning in an angry and impatient tone; and though generally she could only distinguish here and there a word, yet one morning particularly, whilst Lady Suffolk, who always spoke in a low voice, seemed to be talking a long while together, the King every now and then interrupted her by saying over and over again: "That is none of your business, madam; you have nothing to do with that." The lady who told me this, being a little addicted to weave fable in her narratives, I should not have given credit enough to the story to insert it had she not related it to me before the transactions of the summer, and consequently when she could not do it from that vanity, as natural perhaps to her as to many other people, who love, upon the arrival of a remarkable incident which few expected, to tell you some circumstances by which they endeavour to show they were, by their great sagacity or good intelligence, much earlier apprised of it than the gross herd of the world.

Towards the latter end of the summer Lady Suffolk, who had long borne His Majesty's contempt, neglect, snubs, and ill-humour with a resignation that few people who felt so sensibly could have suffered so patiently, at last resolved to withdraw herself from these severe trials, from which no advantage accrued but the conscious pride of her own fortitude in supporting them with prudence.

On the pretence, therefore, or, more properly speaking, on the plea of ill-health, she asked leave to go for six weeks to drink the Bath waters; from thence she returned the day

before the birthday to St. James's, but the King went no 1734
more to her apartment, and when he met her in the
Queen's dressing-room spoke to her with the same in-
difference that he would have done to any other lady of
the Queen's family, asking her only some slight common
drawing-room question.

That the King went no more in an evening to Lady
Suffolk was whispered about the Court by all that belonged
to it, and was one of those secrets that everybody knows,
and everybody avoids publicly to seem to know.

Various were the sentiments of people on this occa-
sion. The Queen was both glad and sorry. Her pride was
glad to have even this ghost of a rival removed; and she
was sorry to have so much more of her husband's time
thrown upon her hands, when she had already enough to
make her often heartily weary of his company, and to de-
prive her of other company which she gladly would have
enjoyed.

I am sensible, when I say the Queen was pleased with
the removal of Lady Suffolk as a rival, that I seem to con-
tradict what I have formerly said in these papers of her
being rather desirous (for fear of a successor) to keep Lady
Suffolk about the King, than solicitous to banish her; but,
in describing the sentiments of the same people at different
times, human creatures are so inconsistent with themselves,
that the inconsistency of such descriptions often arises,
not from the mistakes or forgetfulness of the describer,
but from the instability and changeableness of the person
described.

The Prince, I believe, wished Lady Suffolk removed,
as he would have wished anybody detached from the
King's interest; and, added to this, Lady Suffolk having
many friends, it was a step that he hoped would make his
father many enemies. Neither was he sorry, perhaps, to
have so eminent a precedent for a prince's discarding a
mistress he was tired of.

The Princess Emily wished Lady Suffolk's disgrace

1734 because she wished misfortune to most people; the Princess Caroline, because she thought it would please her mother; the Princess Royal was violently for having her crushed, and when Lord Hervey said he wondered she was so desirous to have this lady's disgrace pushed to such extremity, she replied: "Lady Suffolk's conduct with regard to politics has been so impertinent that she cannot be too ill-used"; and when Lord Hervey intimated the danger there might be, from the King's coquetry, of some more troublesome and powerful successor, she said (not very judiciously with regard to her mother, nor very respectfully with regard to her father): "I wish, with all my heart, he would take somebody else, that Mamma might be a little relieved from the ennui of seeing him for ever in her room." At the same time the King was always bragging how dearly his daughter Anne loved him.

Sir Robert Walpole hated Lady Suffolk, and was hated by her, but did not wish her driven out of St. James's, imagining somebody would come in her place who, from his attachment to the Queen, must hate him as strongly, and might hate him more dangerously.

The true reasons of her disgrace were the King's being thoroughly tired of her; her constant opposition to all his measures; her wearying him with her perpetual contradiction; her intimacy with Mr. Pope, who had published several satires, with his name to them, in which the King and all his family were rather more than obliquely sneered at; the acquaintance she was known to have with many of the opposing party, and the correspondence she was suspected to have with many more of them; and, in short, her being no longer pleasing to the King in her private capacity, and every day more disagreeable to him in her public conduct.

About a fortnight, therefore, after her return from the Bath, finding the King persist in withholding his usual visits, she took the resolution of quitting the Court. She

neither had, nor desired to have (that I ever heard, at 1734
least) any *éclaircissement* with the King, or to take any
leave of him, but asked an audience of the Queen, with
whom she was above an hour and a half alone, and resigned Nov. 11
her employment of Mistress of the Robes. The next day
she left the Palace and went to her brother my Lord
Hobart's house in St. James's Square.

What she said to the Queen I never could learn, and,
considering all circumstances, it must be very difficult to
guess, since I cannot imagine the mistress could say to the
wife: "Your husband not being so kind to me as he used
to be, I cannot serve you any longer." And for any other
reasons Lady Suffolk could allege for quitting the Queen's
service, I am as much at a loss to comprehend what they
could be as I believe she was to invent them.

This great Court revolution was for some time the talk
of the whole town. Those who were inclined to make it
a topic of invective against the King said it showed the
hardness of his nature that, after Lady Suffolk had under-
gone twenty years' slavery to his disagreeable temper and
capricious will, after she had sacrificed her time, her quiet,
her reputation, and her health, to his service and his plea-
sure, he could use a woman of her merit, prudence, and
understanding so ill as to force her to this step, and for no
other reasons than her having, contrary to the servile
conduct of most courtiers, risked his favour in consulting
his interest, and ventured to tell him those disagreeable
truths which few favourites have honesty and regard
enough for their benefactors to impart, and fewer princes
sense enough to bear being informed of, though for want
of such information in time so many princes have been at
last undone.

To have heard Lady Suffolk's friends, or rather the
King's enemies, comment on this transaction, one would
have imagined that the King, instead of dropping a mis-
tress to give himself up entirely to a wife, had repudiated
some virtuous, obedient, and dutiful wife, in order to

1734 abandon himself to the dissolute commerce and dangerous sway of some new favourite.

Those who justified the King upon this occasion said it was very natural for a man of so uxorious a turn, and so passionately fond of his wife, to think little of any other woman, especially at his time of life; and that nobody surely could imagine there was any great immorality or any great injustice in his giving those hours to the Queen which he used to pass with Lady Suffolk; nor was it very surprising that, in consulting his pleasure only, he should prefer the conversation of a woman who was all cheerfulness, resignation, and compliance, to that of another who was for ever thwarting his inclinations, reflecting on his conduct, and contradicting his opinion; that he should like one who was always flattering him better than one who was always finding fault with him; or be more pleased with her who was always solving difficulties than with her who was always starting them. It was further added that, since the King intended to continue Lady Suffolk's pension, sure she had no reason to complain, or to think the punishment inflicted on her for censuring his Ministers and condemning all his measures a very severe one, since it was nothing more than his withdrawing himself from hearing what he could not prevent her from uttering.

The malcontents were extremely pleased with this new acquisition to their party, and exulted much in the hopes of this ungrateful conduct of the King's, as they called it, towards Lady Suffolk, occasioning great clamour, and increasing the odium which these industrious anti-courtiers lost no opportunity of propagating against him. But it was a great alloy to their joy, and a great satisfaction to those they opposed, to see this back door to the King's ear (the only way by which any reflections on his Ministers could be conveyed) at last shut up. Nor was it matter of less sorrow to one party than joy to the other to imagine that, after so signal a sacrifice to the Administration, few people

in the palace, though ever so well disposed to the Oppo- 1734
nents or disaffected to the Minister, would venture, by
the same remonstrances to the King, to incur the same
fate; everybody, both friends and foes, being equally
persuaded that the example of this wreck would deter any
other person from sailing near those rocks on which Lady
Suffolk had split.

As to the clamour this event would occasion, they must
know very little of the nature of Courts or mankind who
flatter themselves that the disgrace of one person, let that
person be ever so amiable or considerable, would be any-
thing more than the novel of a fortnight, which everybody
would recount and everybody forget; or that an enemy
out of the Court would ever be able to give material dis-
turbance to those whom they vainly endeavoured to molest
whilst they were in it.

In this manner, then, after twenty years' duration, ended
the nominal favour and enervate reign of poor Lady
Suffolk, who never had power enough to do good to those
to whom she wished well, though, by working on the
susceptible passions of him whom she often endeavoured
to irritate, she had just influence enough, by watching
her opportunities, to distress those sometimes to whom
she wished ill.

About the time of this disgrace there happened another,
in the Prince's Court, of a very different nature; I mean
that of Mr. Dodington, which began now to be com-
monly known and publicly talked of, but in a manner very
unlike that in which people spoke of Lady Suffolk's. For
as, in Lady Suffolk's case, many from political considera-
tions rejoiced at her removal, though none from personal
enmity rejoiced at her misfortunes, so with regard to Mr.
Dodington it was just the reverse; nobody in a political
light thinking it of any consequence whether he was in or
out of the Prince's favour, and everybody, from personal
dislike to the man, being glad of his meeting with any
mortification. Mr. Dodington, whilst some people have

1734 the *je ne sais quoi* in pleasing, possessed the *je ne sais quoi* in displeasing, in the strongest and most universal degree that ever any man was blessed with that gift, being, with good parts and a great deal of wit, as far from agreeable in company, as he was, notwithstanding his knowledge and his great fortune, from being esteemed by any party, or making any figure in the State. He was one of those unfortunate people whom it was the fashion to abuse, and ungenteel to be seen with; and many people really despised him, who naturally, one should have imagined, were rather in a situation to envy him. His vanity in company was so overbearing, so insolent, and so insupportable, that he seemed to exact that applause as his due which other people solicit, and to think he had a right to make every auditor his admirer.

The reason the Prince gave for disliking and discarding him was that he hated those trimming dastard souls that had not resolution enough to oppose those whom they were always condemning; and could never think such men honest as were always abetting those measures in public which they were always censuring in private, any more than he could ever approve people's conduct who were perpetually acting openly in concert with the very men that they were for ever secretly abusing and defaming.

Right sentiments these, and pompous expressions; but the Prince's heart was no more capable of giving birth to such sentiments, than his capacity was of clothing them in such words. Lord Chesterfield had repeated these sayings till the Prince had got them by heart, and then gave them as his own reasons for doing from honesty and judgment that which in reality he did from levity and weakness.

The Prince used to say, too, that it was impossible but that there must be something very wrong in a man who not only had no friend, but whom everybody who mentioned him at all spoke of as an enemy.

Mr. Lyttelton, a nephew of Lord Cobham's, whom

Dodington had brought about the Prince, had contributed 1734 too to this disgrace; for Dodington, from irresolution, or fear of throwing the Prince (as I have said before) into the hand of those who were at the head of the opposing party, had dissuaded the Prince from going those lengths to which Lord Cobham and Lord Chesterfield, who were exasperated to the last degree against the Court, wished to drive him. Lyttelton, therefore, who did and said everything his uncle, Lord Cobham, wished he should, was for ever, by proxy from Lord Cobham, suggesting at one ear what Lord Chesterfield at the other was administering in person, both of them inculcating that Dodington's game was so to play the Prince's favour as to keep him in a sort of *équilibre* till he found to which party he could sell His Royal Highness to the best advantage.

Among many other things which Lyttelton suggested to the Prince to depreciate Dodington, he once said to him: "Though I hate Sir Robert Walpole myself, and think him a bad man and a bad Minister, yet, when I reflect how partial he has formerly been to Dodington, the favours he has conferred upon him, the manner in which he brought him into the world, and the credit in which he supported him there, I own I am shocked when I hear Dodington railing at him; and though all he says may be true, yet the obligations he has to Sir Robert Walpole make me hate the ungrateful man who can forget them; and I feel myself more exasperated against Dodington for publishing and exaggerating Sir Robert Walpole's faults than I am against Sir Robert for committing them."

Whilst Lyttelton was saying these things to the Prince, he never reflected that it was Dodington who brought him first to that ear into which he was now pouring them; and that he himself was, consequently, in a stronger degree, the very thing to Dodington which he was so vehemently reviling Dodington for being to Sir Robert Walpole.

This new favourite, Mr. Lyttelton, was, in his figure, extremely tall and thin. His face was so ugly, his person

1734 so ill made, and his carriage so awkward, that every feature was a blemish, every limb an incumbrance, and every motion a disgrace. But, as disagreeable as his figure was, his voice was still more so, and his address more disagreeable than either. He had a great flow of words that were always uttered in a lulling monotony, and the little meaning they had to boast of was generally borrowed from the commonplace maxims and sentiments of moralists, philosophers, patriots, and poets, crudely imbibed, half digested, ill put together, and confusedly refunded.

Dodington's house in Pall Mall stood close to the garden the Prince had bought there of Lord Chesterfield, and during Dodington's favour the Prince had suffered him to make a door out of his house into this garden; which, upon the first decay of his interest, the Prince shut up, building and planting before Dodington's house, and changing every lock in his own to which he had formerly given Dodington keys. Dodington, when he found Lord Chesterfield had supplanted and Lyttelton undermined him, retired into the country unaccompanied, and as much unpitied in his disgrace as unenvied in his prosperity.

When Lord Hervey told Sir Robert Walpole early in the summer, when few yet knew it, that Dodington had lost the Prince's favour, the way he came to know it was by Miss Vane, with whom he was now privately reconciled, and who ventured to meet him in secret once or twice a week, and at these meetings entertained him with the account of everything she learned from the Prince or observed either in him or the people about him. The manner of her reconciliation to Lord Hervey was from their seeing one another in public places and there mutually discovering that both had a mind to forget their past enmity, and renew their past endearments, till from ogling they came to messages, from messages to letters, from letters to appointments, and from appointments to all the familiarities in which they had formerly lived, both of them

swearing that there never had been any interruption in 1734 the affection they bore to each other, though the effects of jealousy and rage had often made them act more like enemies than lovers. The place of their meeting was an out of the way scrub coffee-house, little frequented, behind Buckingham House, where neither of them were known. Lord Hervey used to walk thither from Kensington in a morning after he was dismissed from the Queen, and Miss Vane could easily, under the pretence of walking in St. James's for her health, slip out unobserved to this rendezvous, with a hat over her face, as guarding it from the sun, whilst her chair and servants were left waiting at St. James's. These adventurous intriguers, encouraged by their frequent meetings having hitherto passed unobserved and unsuspected, grew so imprudent and so bold that, Miss Vane being obliged by the Prince's order to take a house at Wimbledon on account of her son's health, she came to town once a week on purpose to see Lord Hervey. The place of their meeting upon these occasions was her own house in London, where she herself always opened the door to admit him after it was dark, on foot and wrapped up in a cloak; and having but one servant in town it was easy for her to contrive to send that one out of the way at the hour she was to let her lover in or out. By these means they often passed the whole night together as free from apprehension as if they had been exposed to no danger. This was a great indiscretion in both, but much greater in the one than the other, as Lord Hervey on a discovery would only have been much blamed, whilst Miss Vane would have been absolutely ruined. But when two people have a mutual inclination to meet, I never knew any objection that ought to arise in their own mind prevent their aiming at it, or any foreign obstacle hinder their accomplishing it.

I shall now return to the Princess Royal, who, the day after she came to Harwich, embarked there for Holland. When she had been some time at sea she grew so ill that

1734 she either was, or made all those about her say she was, in convulsions; and the wind not being quite fair, she obliged the captain of the yacht, after lying several hours at anchor, to tack about and put her again on shore at Harwich. As soon as she arrived there she despatched a courier to London with letters (written, as it was supposed, by her own absolute command) from her physician, her man-midwife, her surgeon, and her nurse, to say she was so disordered with this expedition that she could not be stirred these ten days from her bed without running the greatest danger of miscarrying, nor put to sea again at all without the hazard both of her child's life and her own. All her train wrote in the same style; and the same judgment was made on these proceedings by the King and Queen, the whole Court, and the whole kingdom—which was, that Her Royal Highness was determined, if possible, to persuade, entreat, or fright, her husband and her parents into consenting that she should lie-in in England.

The King and Queen, though she wrote for orders what she should do, declined giving any, but said the Prince of Orange ought to be consulted, and his directions followed. The Prince of Orange was written to by the same people who had written to the King and Queen, and in the same strain. But he, knowing of what prejudice it would be to his affairs to have the Princess Royal lie-in in England, and seeing plainly it was that she drove at, wrote to his wife to propose her coming by Calais, and to the Queen to beg of her not only not to oppose this proposal, but to expostulate with her daughter, and forward this expedient, in case she found the Princess averse to it.

These delays made the King, who was always impatient under unavoidable difficulties, but outrageous with those who started any unnecessary ones, so peevish with his daughter that he made the Queen write to say she must and should lie-in in Holland; and, since the Prince of Orange desired she might go by Calais, and that it was thought for her safety she should do so, he consented to

it; but this was much against his will, on account of the 1734
uncertain terms upon which this Court now was with the
Court of France. At the same time that the King ordered
the Duke of Newcastle to let M. Chavigny know that the
Prince of Orange desired the Princess Royal might go by
France into Holland, he charged his Grace to insist on her
being received there entirely as a private person; and that
there might not at St. James's be all the bustle of a new
parting, which must have been the consequence of a new
meeting, he ordered the Princess Royal to go across the
country the nearest way from Harwich to Dover, without
coming by London. But His Majesty being afterwards
informed that those roads were impassable at this time of
the year in a coach, he said then she might come to London
and go over the bridge; but that positively she should not
lie in London, nor come to St. James's. Accordingly,
after all her tricks and schemes to avoid going to Holland,
and to get back to London, she was obliged to comply
with these orders, and had the mortification and disgrace
to go, without seeing any of her family, over London *Nov. 21*
Bridge to Dover, from whence, by Calais (where the
Prince of Orange met her), she went through Flanders
to Holland.

Everybody condemned her conduct in this whole affair,
in which her passions and her inclinations entirely got the
better of her reason and her understanding. In the first
place, everybody wondered she should mistake her own
interest, and sacrifice her husband's, so far as to desire to
lie-in here; and, in the next place, that she should judge so
ill as to imagine, though she was imprudent enough to
desire it, that it would be possible for her to compass it;
or that she should not be deterred by her love to England
from showing there were so many difficulties attended her
coming hither. Already the resolution was taken and
declared, both by the King and Queen, that upon no ac-
count would they ever give her leave to come here again
when she was with child. The Queen saw all the false steps

1734 her daughter had made, and, as she could not quite disown them, blamed them a little, but repined at them more. The King, teased with the difficulties attending this journey, and not extremely pleased with the expense of it (which amounted to £20,000), said he would positively hear no more about it, and snapped everybody who mentioned the Princess Royal's name. The Princess Emily, as much as she dared, censured and condemned her sister's conduct; the Princess Caroline, as much as she could, excused and softened it. The Princess Emily told Mrs. Clayton she was very glad her sister was to lie-in in Holland, not only for the sake of the Prince of Orange's affairs, for which she thought it absolutely necessary, but because she was sure her brother would have disliked, of all things, her sister's being brought to bed in England. Mrs. Clayton very pertinently and reasonably replied: "I cannot imagine, Madam, how it can affect the Prince at all where she lies-in, since, with regard to those who wish none of Your Royal Highness's family on the throne, it is no matter whether she is brought to bed here or in Holland, or of a son or a daughter, or whether she has any child at all; and, with regard to those who wish all your family well, for your sakes, Madam, as well as our own, we shall be very glad to take any of you in your turns, but not one of you out of it."

During all these transactions the Queen, though mending, continued ill enough to keep her room, and did so till the end of November.

When Sir Robert Walpole came back from Norfolk he affected talking of Lady's Suffolk's abdication as a thing that had greatly surprised him when he heard it, disclaiming entirely the having had any hand in her disgrace, though he knew, he said, it had been imputed to his cabals. But this was giving himself a very unnecessary trouble; few people believing that he had not done Lady Suffolk all the ill offices he could, and of those few not one imagining that, if he had not done his utmost to drive her from the palace,

it was from any tenderness towards her that he had desired 1734
she should remain there.

But, whatever pleasure Sir Robert Walpole might find from this domestic incident, it was much overbalanced by the concern he felt from a foreign transaction. For, notwithstanding he was so sanguine when he went into Norfolk, and so secure that nothing could happen to defeat the proposal he had at last brought Their Majesties to make at Vienna, of marrying the second Archduchess to Don Carlos, yet his back was no sooner turned but the King and Queen (as Lord Hervey told him they would) relapsed into their former reluctance, or rather abhorrence, to this union. Nor was it unsuspected by Sir Robert, though he could never prove it, that the King himself, either by Lord Harrington or by a juggle through some German hand, did convey some hint to Mr. Robinson (the English minister at Vienna) not to be too pressing to bring this affair of the marriage to a successful issue. When Mr. Robinson's answer came back, which was to give an account of the conference he had held with the Imperial Ministers in consequence of the commission he had received to treat of this marriage, his despatch was certainly, for the purpose it was to serve, extremely well drawn; that is, it was impossible more plausibly to defeat what his public orders were to promote, or more artfully to gloss over a series of reasoning which, stripped of the florid poetical ornaments with which Mr. Robinson's despatches always abounded, and reduced to a plain narrative, seemed rather to be the production of a German courtier, flattering the unreasonable pride of an Austrian prince, than of an English minister, concerned for the service of his master, the interest of his country, or the repose of Europe.

When Sir Robert Walpole went into the King's closet the day after this despatch arrived from Robinson, the first thing the King said to Sir Robert Walpole was: "You find me with Robinson's letter in my hand, which I have just been reading again for the third time, and I

2734 think it the ablest despatch and the best drawn paper I ever read in my life." Sir Robert smiled and made no answer; upon which the King asked him why he did not speak, and desired him to give his thoughts freely upon it. Sir Robert said, the reason why he made no answer was because he would never speak anything but his thoughts, and that those, unless he was commanded to deliver them, it was sometimes more respectful as well as more prudent to keep to himself. "What do you mean?" replied the King. "I mean, Sir," said Sir Robert, "that this is either the weakest or the ablest despatch I ever saw; but which of the two it is, Your Majesty can only determine. If Mr. Robinson had no orders but what the Duke of Newcastle conveyed to him, and I was consulted in, Mr. Robinson ought to be recalled by the next messenger that goes to Vienna, and disgraced. If he had any others, those who are ignorant what those orders were can never be proper judges how well or how ill they have been executed." The King seemed disconcerted, and neither denied nor avowed any secret instructions conveyed to Robinson; but said he thought the letter was a very sensible account of those difficulties, unforeseen here, which very naturally arose in the councils of Vienna to a proposal certainly little for their honour, and very doubtfully for their interest. The King turned the conversation, immediately after he had said this, to some domestic subject, and never entered upon it afterwards. But Sir Robert Walpole, when I have spoken to him of this match being the only natural and safe termination of these squabbles, has always answered: "This match had long ago been perfected, had it not been for Mr. Robinson, who deserved hanging for his conduct in that affair," adding, that he was as obstinate a German and as servile an Imperialist as Hatolf.

There happened this year some commotions in the Church, proceeding from promotions to be made there, which I must not pass over in silence. The two vacant sees of Gloucester and Winchester gave rise to these

contests. But though Winchester was one of the best, and Gloucester one of the worst bishoprics in England, yet the latter occasioned much the greatest struggle, contrary to the common course of ecclesiastical disputes, where the degree of contention is generally proportioned to the degree of profit annexed to the thing contended for. 1734

The bishopric of Winchester, whenever it should fall, had been long promised, both by the Queen and Sir Robert Walpole, to Bishop Hoadly, to palliate the disappointment and the injustice, as he thought it, and most people called it, of Durham having been given to another. This promise had been solemnly and frequently renewed to him during the time in which the Court had applied to him to divert the storm, already mentioned, that threatened two years ago from the Presbyterian quarter about the Test Act. Lord Hervey, who had great friendship for Bishop Hoadly, knew that neither the King, Queen, nor Sir Robert Walpole loved him, and would be glad, if they could have found any way to put him by, not to confer this benefice upon him. Immediately, therefore, upon hearing that the Bishop of Winchester was seized with an apoplectic fit, of which it was impossible he should recover, Lord Hervey despatched a messenger to Salisbury, where Bishop Hoadly then was, with the following letter:

KENSINGTON, *Aug. 7, 1734.*

MY DEAR LORD,

I have often sent you letters of no consequence, merely for the pleasure of conversing with you, but, for the first time in my life, I hope now to send you one that may be of use to you.

In short, the Bishop of Winchester is certainly dying, and this messenger comes to charge you, on this critical conjuncture, not to let your natural modesty, and hitherto insuperable awkwardness in solicitation, so far get the better of your prudence as to induce you, Mahomet like, to sit still and fancy the mountain of preferment will walk to you to Salisbury. Come up immediately, and in the mean time, since application must be made I need not tell you where (you know the K.'s two ears¹ as well as I do), apply to them both; and, if

¹The Queen and Walpole.

1734 I may advise, act as if you were not secure, and write to them as if you were. Be sure you exert yourself on this occasion, and remember you are now shaking that die upon the cast of which the whole future happiness of your life depends. The odds are of your side, but, as long as there is a possibility of losing, nobody with so great a stake depending can play too cautiously. Do not talk to me of security from former promises; I know Court promises too well to believe they are ever kept, though ever so solemnly made, without being claimed. The best Court paymaster must be dunned, and dunned a good deal—they pay few debts for the honour of paying them. Their memories, too, are abominable—I mean to debts of gratitude, not of resentment.

Remember how you failed of Durham—at least, that from silence you were told you failed. Write therefore now, come, speak, dun, and behave, not as your laziness inclines you, but as your interest directs, as common prudence dictates, as your friends advise, and as what you owe to yourself and your family requires.

Adieu, etc.

The Bishop of Salisbury's answer was as follows:

SALISBURY, Aug. 8, 1734.

MY DEAR LORD,

All the entertainment you have ever given me by your former letters, which has been in truth as great as one ought in reason to wish for, bears no proportion to the real pleasure I had in reading yours this morning. The part you take in my interest, the spirit of friendship which breathes in it, the voluntary advising me in what in truth I need advice, these feel to me more tenderly pleasant, as well as more rationally agreeable, than all that wit and humour which in you I think are inexhaustible. The kind and good advice you give me is the advice of all the packets from my friends at London, and of every heart except my own. But I now yield up that, and am resolved to come up to London, and, as our friend Mrs. Cl[ayton] particularly advised me if this case happened, to write to the Q. herself, as well as to Sir R., from both whom I have had as express assurance of the thing as if one of their messengers, with a postboy before him and a greyhound upon his breast, were sent down to me upon the prospect of a vacancy with a strong letter in form. Particularly Sir R. gave me the kindest reception at Chelsea just before I came hither, and, resolved to speak plainly, said these or like words: "If that vacancy should happen, you are as sure of succeeding as if you were now in possession." After such words, and so many promises to me, repeated to all my friends, I can no more doubt of

that great man's knowing it to be certainly fixed, or of his hearty and effectual concurrence in it, than I can of the plainest thing in the world. But, however, as I have the most express promises, given and renewed without my asking, to claim upon, I can more easily prevail upon myself to work upon myself than I could in a former case in which that particular happiness was wanting. I should be glad of stronger nerves and more courage. Methinks I could go on prating to your Lordship a great while longer, though long enough already you feel, were it not that I have several letters to write by the post of to-day. I therefore must despatch your messenger back again immediately. Adieu. Go on to give me the pleasure of such friendship; and believe me, wherever I am, whether nailed down to the beauties of this place or removed to those of another, whether at Sarum still or at Farnham, I am truly, my Lord,
Yours, etc.

I hope to be in Grosvenor Street on Saturday night. I design to thank Lady Hervey myself for her very obliging answer to what I sent her.

Bishop Hoadly took Lord Hervey's advice, and wrote two letters, one to be given immediately to the Queen, and the other to be given to Sir Robert, as soon as ever the Bishop of Winchester was dead. Both these letters I saw, but have no copies of them. The substance of them was not solicitation, but a modest claim of the promise that had been made him. Lord Hervey came to the Queen just after she had received this letter, and found her in that froward disposition towards Bishop Hoadly which people generally feel when they find themselves pressed to do that which they would but cannot avoid. She asked Lord Hervey if he did not blush for the indecent conduct of this friend in this early and pressing application for a thing not yet vacant. Lord Hervey assured her it was vacant, for that the Bishop of Winchester was actually dead, and that the Bishop of Salisbury had done nothing but what all his friends had advised him to, contrary to the dictates of his own natural modesty and backwardness upon those occasions. He added, too, that one of the reasons formerly alleged for Bishop Hoadly missing of

1734 the bishopric of Durham was his not having asked it, and that it would be very hard he should have failed in one case for having made no application, and be reproached in another for the contrary conduct. Whilst Lord Hervey was speaking the King came in, and as long as the conversation was continued upon this topic, both the King and Queen spoke of the Bishop in such a manner as plainly showed they neither esteemed nor loved him. It is true the principles which Hoadly professed, and the doctrines he propagated, could be agreeable to few princes, as they could only please such as preferred the prosperity of their people to the grandeur of their Crown, the liberties of their subjects to the increase of their own power, the rights and privileges of mankind to the usurpation of sovereigns, the true end of government to the capacity of abusing it, and the cause of justice to the lust of dominion. Potter, Bishop of Oxford, a great favourite of the Queen's, strongly solicited at this time the vacant bishopric of Winchester; and, as Sir Robert Walpole told me, had certainly obtained it, had he not interposed and told the Queen that the engagements she was under to Hoadly were such that it would be scandalous for her to break through them. Whether this was strictly true I know not, but that Hoadly was at last made Bishop of Winchester is certain; and as certain it is, so extraordinary are some Court events, that this preferment, one of the best in the gift of the Crown, was conferred upon a man hated by the King, disliked by the Queen, and long estranged from the friendship of Sir Robert Walpole. The truth was that to palliate a present disappointment they had made reversionary promises which they neither cared to keep nor dared to break. This Hoadly guessed to be the situation of his affairs, and therefore received with no great thankfulness what was bestowed with so little good will—"apud eum plus prior offensa valuisset quam recentia beneficia." And Winchester, now reluctantly conferred, atoned not for Durham, formerly unjustly conferred upon another.

However, when this thing was done, the King, Queen, 1734 and Sir Robert, all three acted perfectly in character, the King not speaking one word to him either when he kissed his hand or did homage, but contriving, as was often his way, to shock whilst he granted, and to disoblige whilst he preferred. The Queen, on the other hand, when she found she could not put him by, resolved to make the most of promoting him, told him how glad she was to see him advanced as high in dignity and profit as he had long been in merit and reputation, and assured him with what pleasure she embraced this occasion of proving to him the sincerity of all her former professions. She acted this part so well too, that the Bishop afterwards bragged to Lord Hervey of the kind manner in which the Queen had received him; and with all his understanding was the dupe of that insincerity to which he was so near being a sacrifice. In the meantime Sir Robert Walpole, by hints to the Bishop himself, and by plainer intimations through his friends, arrogated the whole merit of this promotion to himself, and more than insinuated that he had not been able to incline the King and Queen to this choice, but forced them to make it, even against their inclination.

Sherlock succeeded Hoadly at Salisbury, but the Bishop of London, though Sherlock and he had lived better together of late than they had done, was pleased with neither of these translations.

To the bishopric of Gloucester, which had now been vacant above a twelvemonth, the Lord Chancellor, whilst he was Solicitor-General, had recommended one Dr. Rundle, a chaplain of his father's, the late Bishop of Durham, and a particular friend of his own. This man lay under the suspicion of Arianism; but as this was a crime that could not be proved upon him the objection the Bishop of London made to him was that about fourteen or fifteen years ago he had in private company spoken disrespectfully of Abraham, which one Venn, a parson then in that

1734 company, had told to the Bishop of London and was ready to testify against Rundle upon oath.¹ Those who were inclined to soften the conduct of honest Mr. Venn said the man had done this out of enthusiastic zeal for the cause of the Church, and from the simple dictates of a good conscience, to prevent so improper a pastor from being entrusted with episcopal authority and a Christian flock. Those who put the worst construction, and I believe the truest, upon this proceeding, said that Venn had acted in concert with the Bishop of London to make his court there, and in order to forward his own preferment in the Church by thus obstructing Rundle's. Nobody doubted but that the Bishop of London's sole reason for opposing Rundle was because my Lord Chancellor had made application to the Court in his favour, not through the Bishop of London, but merely upon his own weight and interest; and as the Bishop of London had always disliked what he called lay recommendations, he was determined to make a stand upon this occasion, thinking, if he could show that even so great a man as my Lord Chancellor could not get any one preferred in the Church without applying to him, for the future no other person would attempt it. But as these reasons for opposing Rundle's preferment were such as the Bishop of London could neither urge nor avow, others were to be given to weigh with the Administration, though these only weighed with him. He therefore declared he had no objection to my Lord Chancellor's recommendation, though he had to the man recommended; neither had he any one himself to recommend, or any article to insist upon in this promotion but one, which was to beg, for the love of God, that the King at least would vouchsafe to give the bench a Christian.

¹Venn alleged that Rundle had (a) said that "Abraham was a cunning politician who, to carry his designs, pretended to hold discourse with God"; (b) specifically denied "that God had commanded Abraham to offer up his son Isaac," and (c) repeatedly and publicly "manifested a contempt of the Scriptures." (Egmont, II, 2 and 39.)

Whilst this contest grew every day more warm between 1734 my Lord Chancellor and the Bishop of London, many ranged themselves in the party of the first, from regard to his character, but many more from disregard to that of the latter; and most of those who pretended the greatest commiseration for the hard measure given to Rundle, acted on this occasion as mankind every day act on many others, which is, pretending compassion for the oppressed only that they may inveigh with a better grace against the oppressor, whom they affect to dislike for abusing power, whilst they really hate him chiefly for having it.

The Bishop of London, by his intrigues, got most of the other bishops to join with him, and easily persuaded the majority of the inferior clergy to talk in his strain; for much eloquence is never wanting to induce any class of men to list themselves under the banner of that leader who has the chief power of distributing those rewards in the hopes of which they all enter the service. By these means his Lordship himself first blew the flame against Rundle among the clergy, and then made use of that flame as an argument to Sir Robert Walpole to strengthen the suggestions and solicitations of that very resentment which had raised it. Many pamphlets were written, and with great virulence, on both sides; but the two principals were very differently treated in these productions, for, whilst my Lord Chancellor's name was never mentioned but with decency, the Bishop of London was pelted with all the opprobrious language that envy and malice ever threw at eminence and power.

Sir Robert Walpole, who feared to disoblige either of these great men, but was much more desirous to oblige the one than the other, went to my Lord Chancellor, and begged of him to relinquish his suit in favour of Rundle, offering him at the same time to make Rundle a Dean, or whenever the bishopric of Derry in Ireland should fall, which was now possessed by a crazy old fellow of fourscore, and worth £3000 a year, to send Rundle thither. He

1734 assured him, too, that the King was inclined, as well as himself, to do anything at his request that was reasonable or safe; but as this promotion was so violently opposed by the clergy in general, and the bishops in particular, the King could not, without manifest danger to his own affairs in Parliament, venture to gratify his Lordship on this occasion. He further added that he was sure his Lordship wished so well to the King's affairs and to the common cause, that, however unreasonable he might think the opposition made to Rundle, yet he would not press his promotion to this bishopric if the consequence of it must be the dividing a weight in the House of Lords that had hitherto gone entire, and was so essential to the ease of carrying on the King's business; at the same time desiring my Lord Chancellor to recollect what trouble, in the last Parliament, a defection only of five or six Scotch lords had given, and how much more dangerous consequently it would be for the Court to do anything that might make any breach or produce any revolt among the bishops. He told him, too, that the Bishop of London had absolutely refused to consecrate Rundle in case the King persisted in making him a bishop. To which my Lord Chancellor replied, that the Bishop of London must know, if he did refuse to consecrate Rundle, that he incurred a premunire. Sir Robert said no, for, as it was the Archbishop's business to consecrate him, it was he would incur that penalty in case of refusal; but the Archbishop being ill, and the Bishop of London only acting as his deputy, no man can oblige another to act by a delegated power, and consequently the Bishop of London, by refusing to accept of the delegation, would not be liable to the same penalty that the Archbishop would incur in case he were able to officiate and refused it. My Lord Chancellor then said other bishops might be found to do this office, if the Bishop of London would not. "And would you, my Lord," replied Sir Robert Walpole, "advise or desire the King to do that which should bring this question to be debated, and draw a

point of his prerogative into dispute that had never yet 1734
been controverted? I am sure I will not advise the King
to such a step; and whilst I have the honour to serve the
Crown, and have any influence in the King's councils, I
will rather advise the King never to fill up the see of Glou-
cester than to do it with such consequences attending it."
My Lord Chancellor said: "According to this way of
reasoning, the Bishop of London then must have a nega-
tive on every man the King ever nominated to a bishopric;
and if this manner of arguing was to prevail, instead of the
election made by a Dean and Chapter being only a matter
of form, the King's recommendation itself would become
only a form, and the Bishop of London must give the King
a *congé* to nominate before the King could ever order a
congé d'élire."

Sir Robert Walpole said that the case of Rundle was a
particular case; and though the Bishop of London could
not now relinquish his opposition without losing his
interest with the clergy, yet he believed, as the Bishop was
heartily sorry he had embarked in this opposition, so,
instead of its being an encouragement to give the same
disturbance another time, he believed it would prevent
him from ever falling into the same error again.

"You acknowledge it, then, to be an error?" interrupted
my Lord Chancellor. "I do," said Sir Robert, "but it is
one which I fear it is now too late to remedy. For your
Lordship, you have certainly acquitted yourself to Rundle
by the strenuous part you have taken in soliciting his
cause; but, if I may take the liberty of saying it, I think
there is a duty you owe the King as well as a duty to your
friend. You have discharged the one, and I am persuaded
you will never neglect the other; and if the King, in the
most gracious and kindest manner, does get it intimated
that he wishes you, in regard to him (unwilling to refuse
you and afraid to comply), to urge this suit no further,
perhaps he may expect, when the dispute comes to be
between the endangering his interest or the giving up

1734 Rundle, that your Lordship would not give Rundle the preference."

My Lord Chancellor said Sir Robert Walpole had very artfully brought this matter to a point where he must be silent, but that he looked upon his honour to be so much engaged for Rundle that his silence was no sign of acquiescence.

This conversation passed between my Lord Chancellor and Sir Robert Walpole in the summer, and was partly related to me by Sir Robert himself, and partly by Bishop Hoadly, who had it from the Chancellor.

Many people (indeed most people) blamed Sir Robert for his compliance with the Bishop of London's unreasonable objections on this occasion; and said he would one day or other repent consigning to the Bishop of London that absolute authority which he now suffered him to exercise in Church matters, and of which he did not yet feel the inconveniences.

Sir Robert excused himself by saying whoever had as much power as the Bishop of London would create as much envy, and consequently excite as much clamour against them; and as for the Bishop of London's stickling for Church power, Church discipline, and Church tenets, he thought him in the right, since whoever would govern any class of men must appear to be in their interest. "And I would no more," said he, "employ a man to govern and influence the clergy who did not flatter the parsons, or who either talked, wrote, or acted against their authority, their profit, or their privileges, than I would try to govern the soldiery by setting a General over them who was always haranguing against the inconveniences of a standing army, or than I would make a man Lord Chancellor who was constantly complaining of the grievances of the law, and threatening to rectify the abuses of Westminster Hall."

Notwithstanding the resolution Sir Robert Walpole made and declared to everybody in the summer, of keeping the bishopric of Gloucester vacant till this dispute between

the Lord Chancellor and the Bishop of London could be 1734
adjusted, and one of them be brought to temper and prevailed with to recede, he changed his mind; and the Bishop of London insisting on its being filled up, and not with Rundle, Sir Robert Walpole went in form, about a month before the Parliament was to meet, from the King to my Lord Chancellor, to let him know how sorry His Majesty was that it was impossible he could be gratified in Rundle's being made a bishop; but that the King, to show the regard he had for my Lord Chancellor, was willing and ready to prefer any other person whatever whom his Lordship would nominate to that benefice.

My Lord Chancellor replied that he could not so far abet the injustice done to the character of Rundle on this occasion as to give his consent to Rundle's being put by, and by naming another man seem tacitly at least to admit that he had before named an improper man; that he might be conquered by the Bishop of London, but could not yield to him; and must submit to an absolute decision against his friend, but would not, nor could not in honour, listen to any compromise.

Thus ended this conversation. Soon after Dr. Benson was made Bishop of Gloucester, and Dr. Secker Bishop of Bristol, both of them learned and ingenious men, of unexceptionable characters, and both of them formerly chaplains to my Lord Chancellor's father, the late Bishop of Durham. This last circumstance was thought to have been weighed in the choice of these men, as a sugar-plum to put the taste of those bitters out of my Lord Chancellor's mouth which they had made him swallow by the rejection of Rundle; and the Irish bishopric of Derry, before mentioned, soon after becoming vacant, Rundle was sent into that lucrative episcopal exile.

The new year was opened with an expedient which put an end to the long contest between the Duke of Richmond and Lord Pembroke for the Mastership of the Horse. The expedient was this. Lord Godolphin having often told

1735 Sir Robert Walpole, his old and intimate friend, that the holding such an employment as Groom of the Stole, to which so much attendance belonged and to which he paid so little, made him extremely uneasy, and that there was another thing he wanted to obtain as much as he wanted to get rid of this, which was his peerage to be continued to the collateral branch of his own family of Godolphin, Sir Robert Walpole took advantage of these sentiments to propose to the King the making of Lord Pembroke Groom of the Stole, and the Duke of Richmond Master of the Horse, without letting the King know that Lord Godolphin had a mind to quit, but proposing to the King to buy his consent to this accommodation by offering him the peerage to be entailed on his cousin Godolphin after his death.

But there were two great difficulties attended the gaining His Majesty's consent to this scheme. The one was that the King would be at no additional expense, whilst Lord Godolphin, if he quitted, must have a pension; the other was that the King did not at all relish the entailing a peerage on Mr. Godolphin, who had married a daughter of Lady Portland, to whom both the King and Queen bore a most irreconcilable hatred for accepting the employment of governess to their daughters in the late reign without their consent, at the time they had been turned out of St. James's, and the education of their children, who were kept there, taken from them.

Lord Godolphin's salary as Groom of the Stole was £5,000 a year; and Lord Pembroke's as Lord of the Bed-chamber £1,000. Sir Robert Walpole, therefore, prevailed with Lord Godolphin, in consideration of the peerage which he had so much at heart, to accept of a pension of £3,000 a year, and Lord Pembroke to take the key, with £3,000 more, which reduced the expense of this jumble within the limited sum. When Sir Robert Walpole had proceeded thus far in the negotiation, he acquainted the King with what he had done, who still boggled at giving the peerage,

and, not caring to own the true reason, said there was a time 1735 that the Lord Treasurer Godolphin had been as great a Jacobite as any man in the kingdom, and yet Sir Robert Walpole was now urging him to bestow this honour on the heir of his odious family. Sir Robert said it was true, as the Lord Treasurer Godolphin had been page to King James the Second, he was suspected, whilst his old master lived, to whom he had had so many and so great obligations, to have a partiality towards him; but all that partiality had died with King James, and that nobody had ever accused or suspected the late Lord Godolphin of any attachment to his son, the present Pretender. Sir Robert added to this plea that of the present Lord Godolphin's firm, undoubted, and uninterrupted attachment to His Majesty's family; and said to the King, "Sir, for my sake I beg Your Majesty would grant this boon to Lord Godolphin, and give me leave to look upon it as a particular favour done to one of the best friends I have in the world, at my request."

The King made answer, "You are always teasing me to do things that are disagreeable to me, and for people I dislike." However, with much ado Sir Robert got his consent, thanked him for it, and did not leave him time to repent, but the moment he went out of the closet sent to all the three Lords to let them know they might come the next morning to kiss the King's hand, which ac- Jan. 8- cordingly they did, Duke of Richmond as Master of the Horse, Lord Pembroke as Groom of the Stole, and Lord Godolphin for his barony entailed on his cousin-german.

Lord Godolphin was a very singular character, for though he was a man of undoubted understanding and strict honour yet he passed his whole life with people who had neither. Natural modesty, indolence, and laziness, made him exert himself but little in the great and the busy world; and his chief if not his only pleasures being wine and running horses, he passed almost all his time in low company, who could talk sense in no character but that of

1735 jockeys, and acted, even in that character, as little like gentlemen as they talked.

Lord Pembroke's character was a very different one. Not that he wanted sense, or that he was not very justly esteemed a man of the nicest and strictest honour, but he was quite illiterate, whereas Lord Godolphin was an extremely good scholar, and had a great deal of knowledge. The one, too, was always in bad company, whilst the other was always in the best. And as Lord Pembroke, being much known, was generally esteemed and had many friends, so the other, from the obscurity of his way of life, was so far from having many friends, that, out of the very narrow compass of his own low acquaintance, he was hardly known to exist.

The points that were expected to give the Administration most trouble this year in Parliament were an address for the Prince's marriage and settlement, the opposition to the augmentation of the land forces, and the petition of the Scotch Peers. As to the first of these, it was crushed by the Queen, who, authorized by the King, told the Prince it was His Majesty's intention to marry him forthwith; and that, whoever the Prince had a mind to make this alliance with, the King would not only give his consent but his utmost assistance to complete it. In consequence of this declaration the Queen talked publicly every day of the Prince's being immediately to be married, though nobody could ever learn to whom, and bespoke her clothes for the wedding, and sent perpetually to jewellers to get presents for this ideal future Princess of Wales.

As to the affair of the Scotch petition, it gave as much trouble to the Opposition as to the courtiers; the latter knowing how sore a place it was if it could be laid open, and the former, at the same time they were sensible how much was expected from them by the world on this head, being conscious, too, how little they were able to answer those expectations when they came to collect their materials,

and found how weakly their proofs would answer their 1735 charge. The English Lords in opposition had a great mind to drop the prosecution; but the Scotch Peers who were concerned in it, and had lost both their employments and their seats in Parliament, insisted on being supported, or at least being fought for. They said they did not understand the equity of having been set in the front of the attack upon the Administration, like the forlorn hope, being sacrificed for the sake of the Party, and then deserted by those for whom they had been exposed. On the other hand the English Lords said in their defence that they had lost their employments as well as the Scotch; and that, for their seats in Parliament, if they held those upon a different tenure, it was what the Scotch knew before they embarked; that what each of them had to lose, they had both ventured and both lost; that if there was the least glimmering of daylight to be seen from this prosecution, any advantage to be proposed, or any success to be hoped for, they would gladly pursue it to the utmost; but, on the contrary, they said, as their proofs were so deficient, so to bring this affair to a public trial would be matter of triumph rather than annoyance to the common enemy, and contribute more to the disgrace than the advantage of their common friends.

However, the Scotch Peers insisted and prevailed, but Lord Carteret, and Lord Winchilsea by his influence, refused positively to take any other part in pursuing this unfruitful affair or to give any other assistance, than their attendance and their votes; and accordingly they declined after this going to any of the meetings previous to the bringing this affair before the House of Lords; nor did either of them, after it came to that (as loquacious as they were on all other occasions, both in public and private), open their lips in support of the petition during the whole progress of its presentation, suspense, and dismissal.

Lord Carteret had more reasons than one for declining fighting on this ground. In the first place, he had always in his eye the prospect of being himself in power, and did

1735 not care for weaving fetters for his own hands when he came to be possessed of that much-desired post. In the next, he was not very fond of being enrolled as a lieutenant under my Lord Chesterfield, who had long been looked upon as Commander-in-Chief of this Scotch brigade.

Many people imagined that Lord Carteret's coolness on this occasion proceeded from his being then secretly negotiating his peace with the Court. When I inquired of Sir Robert Walpole if there was any truth in this report, he asked me if I thought him mad enough ever to trust such a fellow as that on any consideration, or on any promises or professions, within the walls of St. James's. "I had some difficulty," added he, "to get him out; but he shall find much more to get in again." He told me, too, at the same time, that, to his knowledge, Lord Carteret had opened two canals to the Queen's ear, but that he hoped to prevent either stream having water enough to turn his mill, though he knew one of them ran much stronger than the other. The two people Sir Robert meant were Mrs. Clayton and Bishop Sherlock, the last of whom he alluded to when he spoke of the strongest interest. He owned this winter, too, to Lord Hervey, that his Lordship had been in the right in what he had told him the year before at Richmond relating to the Bishop pushing at his interest; "but, my Lord," said he, "it is not on the Bishop of London's account that he pushes at me—it is Walpole, not Gibson, that he envies; for his eyes are not half so wistfully turned to Lambeth as they are to St. James's, nor is it more his ambition to be at the head of the Church than at the head of the State."

Lord Hervey said he believed there were very few things which the sanguine vanity of most people did not bring them to think were attainable by their dexterity, and not superior to their merit; but that any man who flattered himself this country was in a disposition to bear a Parson-Minister must know very little of the temper of the present generation.

It is certain, however, that Sherlock's interest at this ¹⁷³⁵ time with the Queen was strong enough to give some trouble to Sir Robert, but still more to the Bishop of London, who had disobliged many of the Whig clergy, and saw himself every day more and more deserted by the Tory clergy that were running under the wing of Sherlock and soliciting his protection.

Sherlock now and then, too, endeavoured to do Lord Carteret service at Court, but hitherto without success; the manner in which the King and Queen this winter spoke of him being not in the least softened, and the "knave" and the "liar" as often tacked to his name as usual. The Queen, however, in speaking of him and Lord Chesterfield, always gave him the preference. She said Lord Carteret was a *coquin dans le grand*, but Chesterfield was a *coquin dans le petit*; that the last was incapable of being a very useful servant to his Prince if he would; but that Lord Carteret had really something in him, though he was not to be trusted. She said Lord Carteret was like a candle that, if he was well watched, could give one some light, but that it was dangerous to trust the one as the other out of one's sight; and that both were full as capable of firing one's house if they were not taken care of, as of being useful if they were.

Lord Carteret and Lord Chesterfield were in some things very much alike, in others very different. They were both of them most abominably given to fable, and both of them often unnecessarily and consequently indiscreetly so, for whoever would lie usefully should lie seldom. They both of them, too, treated all principles of honesty and integrity with such open contempt, that they seemed to think the appearance of those qualities would be of as little use to them as the reality, which must certainly be impolitic, since always to ridicule those who are swayed by such principles was telling all their acquaintance: "If you do not behave to me like knaves, I shall either distrust you as hypocrites or laugh at you as fools."

1735 They had both of them good parts, but parts that were of a very different style. Lord Carteret had a much better public and Court understanding than Lord Chesterfield, and Lord Chesterfield a much better private and social understanding than Lord Carteret; so that this was as much superior to the other in the Senate and the Cabinet ■ the other was superior to him at table and in ruelles.

Jan. 23 When the Parliament met this winter the King opened the session with telling them that the Powers at war had consented that England and Holland should try what they could do towards making a scheme of accommodation, and that accordingly His Majesty and his good friends the States-General were drawing a plan (every article of which was a secret), which he rather wished than hoped might prevent the opening of another campaign, and therefore desired the Parliament would give him a great deal of money, a great many ships, and a great many troops, in order to enable him to act roughly in case talking mildly should prove to no purpose.

Pursuant to these hints from the Throne, thirty thousand men were proposed this year in Parliament for the sea service. Those in opposition said twenty thousand were sufficient, and argued that there was no necessity for voting a greater number this year than had been granted the last; that the Dutch had made no augmentation either by sea or land this year; and that, as our interests were mutual in the present troubles, so, if no augmentation was necessary for Holland, none could be more necessary for England. It was urged, too, that as a war was chiefly to be avoided on account of the detriment it would be to trade, so that reason ought to operate against an increase of seamen, since the merchants last year had complained grievously of the scarcity of seamen, and consequently of the high wages they were forced to pay them; and if this year ten thousand more were to be employed, that inconvenience must be stronger felt, and make our merchants trade under such a burden and such a disadvantage that

the Dutch would run away with all the profits of the trade 1735
of Europe in almost as great a degree as they would engross it in case we were engaged in a war without them. It was said, too, that our naval armaments had been the occasion of so great a fleet being fitted out by France, and of that fleet being kept on the western shore of France, within sight of our coasts, which otherwise would have been sent to Dantzic. It was also strongly insisted upon that the nation was in no condition to bear additional expenses; that if the fatal time should come when, to prevent the total subversion of the balance of power in Europe, we should be necessitated to take a part in this war, it did behove us not wantonly before that time came to squander our treasure and impair our strength, but to keep ourselves in reserve now, and then exert to the utmost of our power. It was likewise said that the King in his speech, and the Ministers in debate, seemed to speak of the contending Powers accepting our good offices as a thing of great moment, and a promising circumstance; but if the manner in which that acceptance was made by either came to be scanned and set in a true light, that little was to be expected from it but a short amusement for the winter, nor could any but transient and delusive hopes of peace be built on such a foundation. The manner in which France had accepted the good offices of the Maritime Powers was nothing more than by saying she was willing to hear any proposals of accommodation we could make, provided we kept ourselves in such an absolute state of impartiality as enabled us to bear the name of mediators. On the other hand, it was true the Court of Vienna had accepted the good offices, but with an absolute promise that the Emperor was not by that acceptance to be excluded (in case this proposal of accommodation did not succeed) from any right he had by former treaties to receive the succours therein stipulated, and already, in pursuance of those treaties, by him claimed and demanded.

Those on the side of the Court who spoke for the

1735 augmentation answered these objections in the following manner.

In the first place, with regard to no augmentation having been made by the Dutch since these troubles began, it was said to be no true proposition; for as thirty thousand men are reckoned by Holland a sufficient standing force for the defence of that country in time of peace, so their having fifty-two thousand men now on foot must be reckoned as an augmentation on account of the troubles, especially since everybody knew that after the conclusion of the last Treaty of Vienna the Dutch had determined to make a reduction of twenty-two thousand men in two years, twelve the first and ten the second; and on the breaking out of this war had changed that resolution.

It ought further, too, the Court party said, to be considered, that though Holland had made no augmentation by sea, yet as their natural defence was land-forces, as ours was naval armaments, so no parallel ought to be drawn between us and them with regard to an augmentation by sea, but the comparison to be made (if any) between what we were doing by sea and what they actually had done by land.

As to the interests of England and Holland being mutual on this occasion, as urged by those who opposed this augmentation, it was undeniable that they were so; but if two Powers, though in the same interest, were in different circumstances, different measures must be taken by them; and if the English Parliament should declare, or give it to be understood, that they would consent to no step to be taken by England but what was taken by Holland, it would be making the counsels of England so dependent upon those in Holland, that if any foreign Power had any influence in the counsels of Holland (which often happens in many States), such a declaration or intimation of the English Parliament would be to assure that Power that, provided they could gain Holland, they

must govern England, and consequently must tie up our hands as effectually as if England had acceded to the Treaty of Neutrality. 1735

As to the inconvenience the merchants suffered from the scarcity of seamen, it was admitted to be an inconvenience, but one which, for the foregoing reasons and the present circumstances of Europe, was unavoidable, and that, if the armaments of England were not strong by sea, that trade would not only suffer inconveniences, but would be entirely stopped; for as the French and Spanish fleets together did consist of between sixty and seventy ships of the line-of-battle, that is, from 50 to 80 guns, so, if England had not a naval force ready to make head against such a power, that we must give up the empire of the seas, as well as the balance of power by land, and of course our trade would not only be inconvenienced, but become entirely precarious.

As to our naval armaments last year having been the occasion of those made by France, it was false in fact, those maritime preparations having been made by France, and their fleet fitted out, before ours was ordered or our seamen were voted; and if the consequence of our fleet being fitted out was the prevention of the French fleet leaving the coast of France and sailing to the north, it was a consequence rather to be rejoiced at than regretted, unless any one thought it for the interest of Europe that France should have been as successful at Dantzic as at Philipsburg or in Italy, and that she would be more inclined to peace from having made greater acquisitions by war, and having nothing but what she was already possessed of to expect from treaty and negotiation.

As to what was said of the little satisfaction it could be to anybody to hear of the good offices being accepted by the contending Powers because no plan of accommodation was very likely to succeed, it was answered that the King himself had in his speech acknowledged the uncertainty there was of success in a negotiation where so many jarring

1735 pretensions were to be satisfied and so many conflicting interests to be adjusted; but that it was still reasonable, since a general accommodation was so much to be wished, that people should have more satisfaction in the first step to that desirable end being on all sides submitted to.

It was said, too, by those who argued on this side of the question, that as, in consequence of the vote of confidence of last year, there were now twenty-eight thousand seamen actually in pay, so the voting only twenty thousand this year was in reality not only voting against an augmentation, but for an actual and immediate reduction of eight thousand men; and whether in the present conjuncture any reduction of seamen was a proper measure to be taken, was submitted to the consideration of every man in the kingdom, within doors and without.

Feb. 7 At last, after a very long debate, the question was put, and thirty thousand seamen were voted by 256 against 183.

On the question for the army there was little more said in the House of Commons than a recapitulation of the same things that had been thrown out in the debate upon the navy; but though the debate on the land-forces was much colder than that on the fleet, the minority was much stronger; the question on the estimate for twenty-five thousand men for the land-service of this year being carried only by 261 against 208. The only public point, besides these I have already mentioned, that was much contested in the House of Commons this session, was the treaty between the Kings of England and Denmark, by which the latter, in consideration of a subsidy of £80,000 a year, obliged himself to furnish the former with six thousand men, in case England entered into the war. The old story of the Hessians was revived on this occasion, and the beaten topic of lavish treaty-making ministers again displayed and laboured. However, this subsidy was *Feb. 28* at last provided for, as well as every other money demand

made by the Court; and the measure in general, considering the present situation of Europe, was not thought improper or unreasonable, since, the south being so much in the power of the Triple Alliance, it was judged not impolitic to keep as many of the Princes of the north as we could in another interest, and not leave the Czarina alone in her opposition to the encroachments of France and support of the cause of the House of Austria. 1735

But whilst these State points in the House of Commons went, though contested, yet at last all of them, according to the desire of the Court, it was not so with the elections, the Court not getting above two members this session upon the balance of that account, and losing several questions on these points that were most industriously solicited, warmly debated, and strenuously pushed. That which made the defeat of the Court and the triumph of the Opposition more remarkable on these occasions was that most of these disgraces happened at the bar of the House, and on debates that lasted not only several days, but till nine, ten, and eleven o'clock at night. The King, who could never bear with common patience the loss of any question he had a mind to carry, was as much out of humour upon every disappointment of this kind as he could have been on the most important defeat; and the Queen, who liked disappointment in what she had once proposed as little as her consort, though she concealed her mortifications better, was thoroughly dissatisfied, and in private let some expressions escape her which betrayed her being so; and even Sir Robert, which was very rare, did not escape without receiving some tokens of her dissatisfaction, saying that Sir Robert Walpole either neglected these things, and judged ill enough to think they were trifles, though in Government, and especially in this country, nothing was a trifle; "or perhaps," said she, "there is some management I know nothing of, or some circumstances we none of us are acquainted with; but, whatever it is, to me these things seem very ill conducted."

1735 The Marlborough election, though strongly solicited, heard at the bar, and made a point of by the Court, went against the Court, in a very odd manner, and without a division. Sir Joseph Jekyll, the Master of the Rolls, who *Mar. 27* spoke against the Court at twelve o'clock at night, after a hearing and debate of two days, was the occasion of the Court at last giving it up. He started a point of law, on which he said the whole turned, and threw out a defiance to any man who understood the law to contradict him. All the lawyers on the side of the Court were mute; upon which Mr. Pelham pressed Sir Robert Walpole, who yielded to him, not to stand a division; and, as the Attorney and Solicitor General, who did not open their mouths to contradict the Master of the Rolls that night, declared some days after, on examination of their books, that the Master was wrong in his point of law, they caused great confusion and many disputes and complaints among the Court party.¹ Everybody blamed the Attorney and Solicitor for their ignorance in not being able to answer the Master on the spot, and for their imprudence, since they had not done it then, for showing afterwards that they might have done it, and for proving the situation of this case to have been like one mentioned in Livy, when he says, "*Non defuit quid responderetur sed deerat qui responsum daret*"—"that there was not a response, but a respondent wanting."

The bulk of the Court party in the House of Commons, even whilst they thought they were in the wrong in the point of law, were extremely angry that they were not allowed, by a division, to show their zeal against law, which seldom had any weight in the decision of elections. When they heard the law was with them, or at least

¹Sir Joseph Jekyll's point was that the case turned upon whether one of the voters in this election had a legal right to a vote; that the Courts, before whom the question had been brought, had decided that he had; and that the Government's proposal amounted to setting aside a verdict of the Courts by a vote of the House of Commons. (Egmont, II, 167.)

doubtful, they were outrageous. Sir Robert Walpole was 1735
angry with Mr. Pelham, whose timidity and affectation of popularity, he said, ever made him in a hurry to drop his friends and cajole his enemies. The Queen, who, at the solicitation of Lord and Lady Hertford, the first one of the Captains of the Horse Guard to the King, the other one of her Ladies of the Bedchamber, had pressed extremely the carrying this election, was very much out of humour when first it miscarried, but more so when she learned in what manner it had been lost. She was displeased with Sir Robert, more so with Mr. Pelham, and most of all with the Master of the Rolls, whom she was always cajoling, always abusing, always hoping to manage, and always finding she was deceived in. He was an impracticable old fellow of fourscore, with no great natural perspicuity of understanding, and had, instead of enlightening that natural cloud, only gilded it with knowledge, reading, and learning, and made it more shining, but not less thick. Study had made many doubts occur, and solved none; and the desire of appearing in the right, more than the desire of being so, forced him often in Parliament to balance in points where vanity wore the appearance of integrity, and where the bias of popularity drew him against the Court without any other weight to incline him to that side. He was always puzzled and confused in his apprehension of things, more so in forming an opinion upon them, and most of all in his expression and manner of delivering that opinion when it was formed; so that his brain, from a very uncommon formation, was, in conceiving sentiments and forming judgments, like some women, who, instead of plain, natural, and profitable births, are for ever subject to false conceptions and miscarriages, or, if they go out their time, bring a dead offspring or a child turned the wrong way. His principal topics for declamation in the House were generally economy and liberty; and, though no individual in the House ever spoke of him with esteem or respect, but rather

1735 with a degree of contempt and ridicule, yet, from his age, and the constant profession of having the public good at heart beyond any other point of view, he had worked himself into such a degree of credit with the accumulated body that he certainly spoke with more general weight, though with less particular approbation, than any other single man in that assembly: and as some people who speak in public, though they have no great respect for the particular people who compose their audience, feel, notwithstanding, an awe for them in their aggregate capacity, so he, without being esteemed by particulars, had the reverence of the corporate body which those particulars composed.

The balance of the Marlborough election was turned, as well as many other points, merely by his weight being thrown into the anti-Court scale. And there was one odd circumstance that made the Queen think this affair of much more importance, and more mortifying to Sir Robert Walpole, than it really was; for, after Sir Robert, the next day, had been giving her an account of it, Lord Hervey happening to be with her that evening, she told him she never saw anything so managed as this business had been, nor Sir Robert Walpole ever so much struck and cast down on any occasion in her life. "He has just been here," said she, "and appeared quite confounded and moped, had neither life nor spirit, and seemed more shocked (which you know he is not apt to be) than I ever saw any man, and even more than he was at the bustle of the excise." Lord Hervey, who knew that nothing was so likely to bring Sir Robert into difficulty in the palace as being thought to feel himself in any out of it, told Her Majesty that he believed she had misconstrued Sir Robert's confusion, and imputed it to a cause very different from that which had really occasioned it; and then told Her Majesty that his mistress, Miss Skerrit, was extremely ill of a pleuritic fever, in great danger, and that Sir Robert was in the utmost anxiety and affliction for her.

The Queen, who was much less concerned about his 1735 private afflictions than his ministerial difficulties, was glad to hear his embarrassment thus accounted for, and began to talk on Sir Robert's attachment to this woman, asking Lord Hervey many questions about Miss Skerrit's beauty and understanding, and her lover's fondness and weakness towards her. She said she was very glad he had any amusement for his leisure hours, but could neither comprehend how a man could be very fond of a woman he only got for his money, nor how a man of Sir Robert's age and make, with his dirty mouth and great belly, could ever imagine any woman would suffer him as a lover from any consideration or inducement but his money. "She must be a clever gentlewoman," continued the Queen, "to have made him believe she cares for him on any other score; and to show you what fools we all are in some point or other, she has certainly told him some fine story or other of her love and her passion, and that poor man—avec ce gros corps, ces jambes enflées, et ce vilain ventre—believes her. My God! what is human nature!" While she was saying this, she little reflected in what degree she herself possessed all the impediments and antidotes to desire which she had been enumerating, and that "My God! what is human nature!" was as applicable to her blindness as to his.¹

However, her manner of speaking of Sir Robert on this occasion showed at least that he was not just at this time in the same rank of favour with her that he used to be; for though she might not always before have been blind to these defects and these weaknesses, at least she had been so indulgent to them as to have been always dumb upon that chapter, and to let these things escape her communicated reflections, if they had not escaped her private observation.

¹The last sentence of this paragraph is not in the Windsor copy. In the original manuscript it had been inked over, but it appears to have been deciphered by Croker.

1735 Nor did these public affairs now transacting in Parliament engross entirely the conversation of the palace. One of a more personal nature was at this time the occasion of many whispers, which was the pregnancy of the Princess Royal. It had been long said and believed by everybody in Holland and England, except the inhabitants of royal apartments, that she was certainly not with child, but the reluctance the Princess had to own it and the Queen to believe it had left it still in doubt where naturally doubt ought first to have been removed. But the Queen, weary of this uncertainty, wrote to Horace Walpole, who was now at the Hague, to bid him suppose himself an old woman for an hour, and, taking Dr. Douglas along with him, to talk like one to the Princess Royal and make her permit Douglas to satisfy himself whether a child was or was not to be expected.

Accordingly Horace and Dr. Douglas went to the Princess Royal, who would permit nothing further than a verbal scrutiny, and whilst she consented to answer all his interrogatories, absolutely denied and obstinately withstood all corporal approaches; upon which Horace wrote to the Queen to let her know what had passed and told her that Douglas said the Princess, if she did not deceive herself or him in what she described, was certainly with child. But as Her Royal Highness would not permit him to be St. Thomas, Douglas desired to have it understood he did not look upon himself to be responsible for the truth of this report, founded on facts which he was to take for granted and could not on his own knowledge assert.

In about a month after this, the latest time being elapsed that could be allowed for a possibility of Her Royal Highness producing a child begotten before the Prince of Orange's departure for the camp and hers for England, it was owned even at St. James's that she had been mistaken in her conjectures, and that no child would be forthcoming. The Prince of Wales was very glad of it; the Queen

very sorry; the Princess Emily laughed; the Princess 1735
Caroline wept; and the King, who had taken every occasion, since the bustle the Princess Royal had made and the expense she had put him to, to show the little affection he felt for her, said he could not imagine why any of her friends should be sorry for anything but the foolish figure she made in not being able to tell whether she had a child in her belly or not, for that as to her having none, he thought it much better so than otherwise, or why anybody should think it such a misfortune that one crooked beggar should not people the earth with more crooked beggars.

I return now to give some account of what passed this session in the House of Lords.

The petition of the Scotch Peers, which had been so long expected, and often said to be dropped, was at last presented by the Duke of Bedford, and conceived in the Feb. 13 following terms:

TO THE LORDS SPIRITUAL AND TEMPORAL, ETC.

The humble petition of James Duke of Hamilton and Brandon, Charles Duke of Queensberry and Dover, James Duke of Montrose, Thomas Earl of Dundonald, Alexander Earl of Marchmont, and John Earl of Stair, sheweth

That at the last election of sixteen peers to serve in the present Parliament for that part of Great Britain called Scotland, the majority of votes was obtained for the Duke of Buccleuch, etc.—who were returned accordingly.

Your petitioners, however, conceive it their duty to represent to your Lordships, that several undue methods and illegal practices were used towards carrying on this election, and towards engaging Peers to vote for a list of Peers to represent the Peerage of Scotland, such as are inconsistent with the freedom of Parliaments, dishonourable to the Peerage, contrary to the design and intention of those laws that direct the election of sixteen Peers for that part of Great Britain called Scotland, and such as may prove subversive of our happy constitution; instances and proofs whereof we are able to lay before your Lordships in such manner as your Lordships shall direct.

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Lordships will

1735 be pleased to take this important affair into your most serious consideration, to allow those instances and proofs to be laid before you, and to do therein as in your great wisdoms shall seem most proper to maintain the dignity of the Peerage and the freedom of the election of the Peers for that part of Great Britain called Scotland, and to preserve the constitution and independency of Parliaments.

As soon as this petition had been read, the Duke of Bedford moved the House, that the petitioners should be appointed to prove the allegations of it that day month.

This motion was opposed by the Lord Chancellor, who said the House was not ripe for such a resolution, and moved that the petition might be taken into consideration
Feb. 20 on that day se'nnight, which after a short debate was agreed to without a division.

When the day for taking the petition into consideration was come, Lord Hardwicke, after a very long, well-studied, and well-digested speech, moved the House to order the Lords petitioners to declare whether they meant by this petition to controvert the seats of the sixteen sitting Lords; to which the Duke of Bedford answered by pulling a paper out of his pocket and reading it to the House, the purport of which was to acquaint the House that he was empowered by the Lords petitioners to declare they did not mean to dispute the seats of the sitting sixteen, nor any one of them.

It was said that the House could not, consistently with its usual and proper forms, receive this oral declaration of the Duke of Bedford as authentic, though every one Lord was far from doubting his having full authority for what he had said. But as the petition was in writing, and signed, so any explanation of it must come the same way. The further consideration therefore of this affair was adjourned to the next day and the Lord Chancellor was ordered in the meantime to write to the Lords petitioners for this explanation, to be given in to the House in the proper form, which was in writing, and signed.

Feb. 21 The next day the petitioners sent this declaration of

not contesting the seats of the sixteen, nor any one of them, 1735 in the form prescribed.

Then the Duke of Devonshire moved the House that the Lords petitioners might be directed to lay before the House the instances of those undue methods and illegal practices complained of in their petition, and the names of those persons by whom they had been practised.¹

There was a long debate on this question; those against the question representing the difficulties under which it would put the Lords petitioners; and those who supported the question saying it was inconsistent with all natural justice and the practice of all courts of justice whatsoever, except the Inquisition, to hear a cause *ex parte*, and to suffer evidence to be brought against any person in a criminal prosecution without that person having notice of such accusation, and being allowed, at the same time that evidence was brought to accuse him, to bring evidence likewise for his defence.

The question was at last carried by a great majority.

The answer of the Lords petitioners was very long and evasive, naming but one fact, which was that of the regiment being drawn out on the day of election, and without naming one person. The reason they gave for their non-compliance with the orders was the impossibility of complying without becoming accusers, which they declared they never designed to be.

Upon this answer being read, Lord Cholmondeley Feb. 28 moved the House to come to the following resolution: "That the petitioners have not complied with the order of this House, by which they were directed to name the facts of which they complained, and by whom those facts were committed."

There was a debate on this question, but it passed at last by a great majority.

The moment after this division Lord Hervey got up and made the following speech and motion, which I insert

¹The motion required this information to be laid on the 27th February.

1735 ■ length, to illustrate the whole progress of this affair from commencement of it to its determination.

MY LORDS,

Though the motion I intend to make would, I think, be sufficiently warranted by the resolution your Lordships have just now come to, as it is, in my opinion, the natural and unavoidable consequence of that resolution; yet, as I always desire to justify in the most ample manner any proposal I ever take the liberty to make to your Lordships, so, before I give my opinion on the step your Lordships ought next to take, I shall beg your indulgence whilst in the shortest and clearest manner I am able I just state the progressive steps of this whole affair from its first rise to the present time, since it is on that very extraordinary gradation, and the collected and compared circumstances of so uncommon a proceeding, that I found that motion which I shall afterward have the honour to make.

I need not be very particular in describing the almost universal flame raised in the nation at the time when the election of the sixteen Peers now sitting with your Lordships was made; the bare naming of the remarkable era will bring back to the memory of every Lord who now hears me the stories that were then in the mouths of most people, and in the ears of all, of the enormous corruption, the flagrant illegality, and even of the unwarrantable violences made use of in this transaction.

What effect the propagating these reports over the whole island produced in the minds of the people, your Lordships are equally well apprised of; for, notwithstanding the majority for the sixteen Lords now sitting in this House was so great that, taking out of the sixteen each list who voted for themselves, the proportion, at a medium, between the two lists appeared to be as 42 to 9, yet it was currently reported, and by many believed, that the return was made in favour of the sixteen now sitting by the weight of power, and contrary to all the right of a free election.

In order to spread, strengthen, and confirm this opinion, pamphlets of the protests made at the Scotch election were written and dispersed over the whole United Kingdoms to assert this fact, and to declare the return unduly made. I mean not by these pamphlets the anonymous scandal of sixpenny books, or the yet cheaper calumny of weekly or daily journals; but pamphlets of far superior authority, with great and noble names affixed to them, and not in the manner that many great and noble names are used—covertly described, or hinted at by initial letters, but written at length, and consequently in

such manner as those who made use of them, had they not been authorised, would have been punished for so doing, or at least disavowed. 1735

In these pamphlets the election for the sixteen returned was declared void and null, and a return claimed for the other list; a declaration was made, equally attested, that several Lords had voted for these sixteen unduly returned who had no right to vote, and that several others who had a right to vote were induced, by a corrupt influence, to make use of that right in favour of the Lords now sitting. To these assertions were added that of a capacity of proving them at a proper time and in a proper place. As everybody understood that proper time to be the meeting of the Parliament, and that proper place the great assembly to which I am now speaking, the whole world was impatient till that interval between the election and the meeting of the Parliament was expired, and big with expectation to have these illegal and unjust practices set forth before the proper judges, that the practisers of them might be punished and the injured be redressed.

And as there could be but two reasons for believing this return had been made unduly—the one the notoriety of the facts, the other the concluding it from the unfitness of those returned to enjoy the honour of representing the Peerage of Scotland; and as no one could think the last, so every one concluded it must be the first. And since I have mentioned this circumstance, I must beg leave, in justice to the sixteen Lords who are sitting here, to ask, unless undue influence manifestly had appeared and could be proved, why it should be supposed to have been necessary, to procure a choice of representatives for the Peerage of Scotland which the whole world must own to be so properly made? If birth, if rank, if ancient families, if property, if honour, if integrity, if blameless and unexceptionable characters, can give man a claim to the honour of representing the Peerage of Scotland, where can sixteen more proper for that honour be found? I will not enter into the copious theme of the particular merits of each of these Lords, because what is so well known to your Lordships is unnecessary to be repeated, and because encomiums of that kind, I am sensible, must be disagreeable to those Lords themselves, as such praise is always most uneasy to the ears of those by whom it is most deserved.

To return, then, to what happened at the meeting of the Parliament, when all mankind expected these tales that had been circulated through the kingdom should be brought to some point; when it was expected that general assertions would be reduced to particular facts,

1735 that general invectives would be thrown into particular accusations, and general complaints brought home to particular delinquents—how were these expectations of mankind answered? The Parliament had been sitting near a month before any complaint at all was brought; and at last, when a complaint was made that seemed to be rather extorted by the expectations of the public than founded on just cause of complaint—when a petition was presented by the complainants, how was that petition signed, and what did it contain? It was signed only by six Lords of all those who had before thought themselves aggrieved; no direct proof, I own, that the rest had, on deliberation and better information, changed their opinion; but no very unnatural cause, sure, to believe that they had done so. For if these six Lords, thinking themselves duly elected, complain as candidates of a return made in their wrong, why are the names of the other ten, who are in the same situation, not added to these? If the petitioners complain of wrong done them as electors, why are not the names of nineteen more in the same situation added to these? And can it be thought any unfair interpretation, any forced construction of this circumstance, to say it ought to be presumed that those who would have been partakers in the injury suffered, if there had been any, by not joining in the complaint on maturer deliberation, are convinced, notwithstanding their first thoughts, that there has no injury been done, and that there is no ground for complaint?

So much I could not help saying with regard to the manner of signing this petition. As to the matter contained in it, it is so far from reducing generals to particulars, it comes so far short of the substance of former complaints, and is conceived in such loose, indeterminate, ambiguous terms, that no one particular crime or criminal is mentioned in the complaint; yet at the same time such extensive terms of complaint used in this petition, that I think there is no species of crime that may not be covertly comprehended in it.

Notwithstanding, therefore, the rebuke I met with¹ in the first debate on this petition for calling this petition an intelligible one, I shall persist in the expression, and think myself warranted in doing so by the best authority I can have, which is the authority of this House; for if the House thought this petition wanted explanation, it is evident it was unintelligible to them as well as to me; nay, it was unintelligible even in the most material point, which was the right of the sixteen Lords returned to their seats in this House. An explanation, therefore, of this point was ordered by the House to be made by the petitioners. And here I must make use of another word

¹From my Lord Gower and Lord Abingdon.—*Note by Lord Hervey.*

formerly objected to me, by calling this permission of explaining 1735
allowed to the petitioners an indulgence towards them; since, without the most particular regard to the rank and merit of the noble persons who signed this petition, and a desire to come to the bottom of reports that had made so much noise in this island, I presume your Lordships would not in common cases think yourselves obliged to be counsel to petitioners at your bar to make that intelligible at last which all petitioners ought to make so at first, or to reduce that to a practicable form which, without your Lordships' assistance, was absolutely incapable of being proceeded upon at all; and for these reasons I called, and continue to call, this petition, as originally presented, not only a petition of an extraordinary and unintelligible nature, but one to which your Lordships have shown extraordinary marks of indulgence.

And notwithstanding former declarations made by those who had signed this petition, that the election for the sixteen returned Peers was null and void, the first explanation made by the petitioners upon your Lordships' order was—that they did not so much as contest the right of the sixteen, or any one of them, nor mean in any way to controvert their seats in this House.

This explanation naturally and necessarily drew on another; for as this explanation only discharged the petition of one part of its ambiguity, your Lordships were obliged to require a further explanation of what facts were complained of, and by whom those facts were committed—an order which I beg leave to say was so far from being a hardship on the petitioners, that it is a direct compliance with part of the prayer of their petition; for as the Noble Lords, your petitioners, do say, after general complaints made, that they are able to lay instances and proofs before your Lordships of these general complaints in the manner you shall be pleased to direct, what is your order but a compliance with their request, and desiring that to be done which they affirm they are able and willing to do?

Nor can I help thinking that even this order was a second mark of your Lordships' indulgence, notwithstanding the offence taken at my making use of that word; for, had a petition of the like nature been presented to the House of Commons (the only case that can justly be compared to this)—had a petition, I say, from any electors been presented there, declaring that such petition did not mean to dispute the seat of the sitting Member, it is indisputable that the House of Commons would immediately have rejected it. Would the House of Commons (the right of the sitting Member uncontested) ever have admitted any number of the electors to come and give a

2735 narrative only of what had passed at the election? Would the House of Commons admit any person or number of persons to come and recount at their bar particular circumstances of transactions at an election that were declared not in any manner to affect the seat of any of their Members? Would the House of Commons give any attention to petitioners who only came and said in general terms—'We have been informed that some things have been done by some persons somewhere, which, if examined into, we believe might be of use to the House to know; though what has been done, where, or by whom, we are unable to inform you'? Does anybody imagine that in the House of Commons any further notice would be taken of such a petition than to reject it? or will anybody say that, if the Commons were to treat petitions of this sort in any other manner—that, considering the number of elections that go to the constituting their body, their whole seven years must not be entirely taken up in hearing them, if any regard at all was paid to the purport of them?

The second order, therefore, which your Lordships gave to your petitioners, I do say was a further indulgence, as well in the substance of it as in (the Lords petitioners written to by the Lord Chancellor, by order of the House) the manner by which both this and the former order were conveyed; a manner denoting such particular regard for the Noble Lords, your petitioners, that no example throughout all your journals can be found of a compliment of the like nature.

I shall not here enter into any vindication of this your Lordships' second order directing the petitioners to specify the facts complained of under the general terms of undue methods and illegal practices, and the names of the persons by whom such undue methods and illegal practices were used; the equity of that order, from all the principles of natural justice, and from the customs of all courts of judicature in all countries and all ages, to avoid hearing any criminal prosecution *ex parte*, was sufficiently demonstrated in the long debate that preceded the making of that order; I shall therefore now consider only in what situation the non-compliance with that order has put your Lordships, and cursorily take notice of the answer made to that order.

A Noble Lord (Lord Anglesey) has been pleased to say that it was not in the power of the petitioners to comply with this order; but I beg leave to observe, that in so saying the Noble Lord alleges that for the petitioners which they have not in their answer alleged for themselves. The petitioners do not say that they are under an inability to comply with your Lordships' order, but they say they

cannot comply with it unless they will submit to be accusers, which they never designed to be: this answer, therefore, evidently implies that, if they would submit to be accusers, they could comply with your order; and indeed, my Lords, the nice distinction made by the petitioners between informers and accusers is a distinction which I know but one way to solve; and that is this,—if the information they intend to give your Lordships be an information of no criminal fact, it may certainly be an information without being an accusation; but then it will, I presume, be thought no very material information, and consequently not worth employing much of your Lordships' time: but if the information be consistent with every other part of their proceedings and declarations, either at the time of the election or since, it must not only be an accusation, but an accusation of the strongest nature. And though another Noble Lord (Lord Chesterfield) was pleased to say the petitioners never designed to name persons, and were not able to say what persons were concerned in the transactions they complain of, I must beg leave to answer, that, though in some papers I have already mentioned (the Scotch Lords' Protest), they have not actually named persons, yet they have so described persons that, if they cannot be justified in naming them when ordered by your Lordships, I am sure they are much less to be justified in having voluntarily so described them that every man in England knows who they mean, whilst the petitioners themselves are conscious they cannot make out what is there laid to the charge of those persons. 1735

Another Noble Lord (Lord Bathurst) says the petitioners only desire your Lordships to go into an inquiry, and argues upon the reasonableness of your going into that inquiry without insisting on a specification of facts and persons, from these two examples:—Suppose (says he) a man comes to a justice of the peace and tells him, Here has been a murder committed; a corpse lies bleeding and butchered in the street, and we desire your warrant to search for the murderer. Would the justice of peace say, No, I will not give my warrant till you name the man you would search for? To this supposition of the Noble Lord's I answer—No. Certainly the justice of the peace would not delay an inquiry; but in this case the fact, at least, is evident; and there is that wide difference between the supposed case and the present case, that in the one there is no doubt of the murder having been committed, whilst in the other there is no more certainty of the murder than there is of the murderer.

The other example the Noble Lord brought was the inquiry your Lordships made two years ago into the South Sea affair; to which I

1735 cannot help saying that I have often heard that all parallels limp a little; but this parallel, my Lords, has not one leg to go upon; for in the South Sea affair both facts and persons were named: the fact was the embezzling or misapplying the public money, the persons were those who had embezzled or misapplied it; and those persons who had done so (if it were done) could only be the Directors of the South Sea Company, who were immediately, in the first step of this proceeding, acquainted with the charges, and ordered to prepare their defence.

These examples, therefore, though brought as parallels to the present case, I think, on examination, plainly appear to be no parallels at all. But this Noble Lord, and another (Lord Bathurst and Lord Anglesey) who spoke just after him in the debate on the last question (which is so blended with the present question that it is impossible to separate them), did desire your Lordships would consider yourselves in the double capacity of legislators and judges, and that it was as much the business of this House to provide against wrongs that may be committed, as to punish wrongs that have been committed. I join with those Lords, and admit that your Lordships may act either in a legislative or a judicial capacity; but I am far from thinking that in these two capacities your manner of proceeding ought not to be extremely different. When your Lordships act as legislators, you will, as all legislators ought to do, consider the depravity of mankind—the iniquity of mankind by their propensity to commit wrong; and your Lordships in that case will act in such a manner as to obviate, by salutary and preventive laws, the evils that may be apprehended to flow from those qualities in mankind, if unrestrained and unintimidated. But though in your legislative capacity you are to conclude all mankind, considered in gross, bad and prone to evil, yet, in your judicial capacity, I beg leave to say you are to conclude just the reverse. When you come in that capacity to sit upon particulars, you are to conclude every man good till he is proved to be bad, and are to take it for granted he has done right till it is manifested that he has done wrong; but to what purpose are your Lordships to make that conclusion if you will proceed in such a manner to try such persons, that, let their innocence be ever so clear, they can have no power to show that innocence at the time it is called in question? and how can they have that power if the prosecution ■ heard *ex parte*?

I know it will be answered that a time will be given to the accused to make their defence; but to apply that answer to the present case,—if the petitioners, who have had this prosecution in

view these seven or eight months, still want a month longer to 1735
prepare their evidence, how much time after that may be necessary
for the persons accused to prepare proper evidence for their defence?
My Lords, there must such a singularity attend this manner of
proceeding, that the more innocent those persons are who are
accused, the more difficult it will be for them to make their defence;
for those who were conscious of having done wrong might, by the
suggestions of their own consciences, have some light to direct them
what path they ought to take for their defence, whereas those who
are conscious of no wrong committed would be entirely in the dark.

What, then, would be the state of those persons who in the course
of this manner of proceeding should stand charged with any criminal
practice? Their accusers would be heard *ex parte* at your Lordships'
bar; witnesses produced whose characters, as well as the matter of
their evidence, might perhaps be objected to (if there was an
opportunity) by those they charge: a calumniating history might be
plausibly told; and this history, under an impossibility during a long
interval of being refuted, would be circulated through the whole
kingdom; and though hereafter perhaps no assertion in this charge
would be better supported when it came to be examined than the
assertion made in Scotland of the election for the sixteen being void,
yet to everybody in the interim those assertions would be told; by the
credulous they would be believed; by the malignant they would be
improved; by the discontented they would be attested; and by the
clamorous they would be trumpeted and inculcated through the
whole kingdom; whilst the light the House of Lords would then
stand in must be, abetting, by the in-equity of their proceedings, the
factious clamours of those whom they ought rather to censure and
punish.

Nay, I will go still further: perhaps even this House itself might
partake of this dangerous taint; for though your Lordships' justice
and candour would prevent your doing any corporate act, or giving
any corporate opinion, on a cause heard in this manner *ex parte*, yet
who can answer for the involuntary conviction of his own private
opinion, or say that, after hearing one side, making a formal accusa-
tion supported by evidence (which always bears some appearance of
proof), that he will or can suspend his belief till he hears what can be
said on the other? and how many plausible falsehoods does everybody
every day hear advanced, to which, till the answer is heard, it is
imagined there can be none!

Upon the whole, my Lords, as your Lordships from the original
rise of this complaint to the present hour have seen this complaint on

1735 every explanation grow weaker and weaker; that these representations of monstrous enormities and injustices committed at the Scotch election, like stories of witches and ghosts, though eagerly and generally received by the vulgar at first, have lost their credit the nearer they have been traced and the more nicely they have been examined and sifted; as the petition is so much weaker than the first general assertions, and every explanation of the petition so much weaker than the petition itself; as your Lordships have endeavoured to throw what was presented impracticable into a practicable form; as you gave an order for that purpose, and have just come to a resolution that that order has been disobeyed; I think the single question remaining for your Lordships to consider is, whether you will adhere to your own order or recede from it—whether you will direct your petitioners in what manner they shall speak, or whether they shall dictate to your Lordships in what manner you shall hear: and as your Lordships, after this refusal to obey your order, cannot possibly, without receding from it, proceed upon this petition; and as you cannot recede from that order, so deliberately and equitably made, either consistently with your honour or your justice, my humble motion to your Lordships is, That the petition be dismissed.

Accordingly the petition was dismissed; and in this manner ended an affair that was grown at last almost as troublesome to those who prosecuted it as it had been at first to those whom it was undertaken to distress; the people in opposition being divided in their opinions and sentiments upon it, and the scent lying very cold by which they were to trace the Administration through the dirty roads that lead to Scotch elections, but where it was as hard to follow them as it would be for strangers to pursue any of the inhabitants of that charming country into their own Highlands.

The King and Queen acted on this occasion as their custom was on many others—that is, by treating the danger of this ruffle, after it was over, with a sort of Falstaff bravery, and pretending always to have despised the kindling of this flame as much as they now did its ashes; but of the apprehensions they were in whilst this business was depending I was often both an eye and ear witness, though they spoke of it afterward even to me in a way that

looked as if they imagined my memory must be as bad as 1735 they wished it, and that it was as impossible for me to reflect on what I had seen and heard as it would have been impolitic and impolite to have mentioned it; or perhaps they did in this occurrence what princes are very apt to do, which is, concluding those courtiers who are politically dumb to be naturally deaf and blind. Yet in the morning before this petition was to be presented, the Queen was so anxious to know what was said, thought, done, or expected, on this occasion that she sent for Lord Hervey whilst she was in bed; and because it was contrary to the queenly etiquette to admit a man to her bedside whilst she was in it, she kept him talking on one side of the door which opened just upon her bed whilst she conversed with him on the other for two hours together, and then sent him to the King's side to repeat to His Majesty all he had related to her.

When the question of the troops came to be debated in *Mar. 13* the House of Lords, the objections made to this augmentation were much the same, in all the strong parts of them, as those that had been urged in the House of Commons. Lord Strafford, a loquacious, rich, illiterate, cold, tedious, constant haranguer in the House of Lords, who neither spoke sense nor English, and always gave an anniversary declamation on this subject, went upon the trite topic of the danger of standing armies to a free state, and knew as little how to adapt his arguments to the particular circumstances, or the times, or the particular temper of his audience, as he did how to give a proper pronunciation to the few words he was master of, or proper words to the few things that came within the narrow limits of his Lordship's knowledge. In short, there was nothing so low as his dialect except his understanding, nor anything so tiresome as his public harangues except his private conversations. There was but one Ciceronian quality (vanity excepted) which I ever discovered in this orator, and that was, that the one did not oftener weave into his orations

1735 the history of his consulship and Catiline's conspiracy, than the other introduced some account of his embassy in Holland at the time of the Treaty of Utrecht, when he had the double honour of being a very dirty executor of a very dirty errand.

The motion for altering the number of forces for the service of this year from twenty-five thousand to eighteen thousand men was made by this ingenious Lord, *digna causa meliore puero*; nor did the cause want good advocates though it had no better a propounder, for Lord Carteret and Lord Chesterfield spoke excellently well in support of this question; and though they only made use of arguments that had already been urged in the House of Commons, yet the one advanced them with so much strength, knowledge, and eloquence, the other with so much wit, satire, and ingenuity, and both with so much applause and popularity, that each of them in their different style, even without that great charm of novelty, gained credit, and spoke almost as much to the satisfaction of their audience on this occasion as they ever did on all occasions to their own.

I wish I had copies of their speeches to insert here; but as I have not, I can only give what was said in answer to them by Lord Hervey, who closed the debate.

MY LORDS,

Notwithstanding the variety of matter that has been thrown into this debate and the many incidental circumstances interwoven with the real objections made to the number of 25,700 men proposed to be kept for the service of the present year, as I have listened with all the attention I am master of to everything that has been said by Lords who oppose the great number and propose the smaller of 17,700, I think the only material objections they have made to the augmentation may be reduced to these three.

First the arguments against standing armies in general.

Secondly the example of the Dutch by whom it is said no augmentation has been made.

And thirdly the unintelligibility of the conduct of England in taking this measure, as in case of peace the augmentation is unnecessary, and in case of war insufficient. 1735

With regard to the first of these objections, I can very readily concur with those Lords who have spoken against the greater number of land-forces in every general proposition they have urged on the danger of standing armies in time of peace to a free Government. I can agree with them that great standing armies are always dangerous in a free state, and have often been fatal; that besides the danger of them in all free countries the great expense and burden of them in this country must always make it a most unadvisable and unjustifiable measure to keep up a larger number of troops than is absolutely necessary from the circumstances of our situation at that time. I can agree, too, that as nothing jars and clashes more with the nature of our constitution than great standing armies in time of peace, so nothing is more repugnant to the inclinations as well as to the interest of the people, and consequently that no measure can be less popular as well as less salutary, than the stretching the number of troops kept up for the service of this country in the least degree beyond bounds which that service absolutely requires.

But having said thus much on this subject I must now beg leave to observe that as I believe none of those Lords who contend for the smaller number of seventeen or eighteen thousand men, would think even those a proper number always to be kept up in this country in time of peace, so even they, though they bring in aid the general arguments against standing armies upon this question, do by their proposal admit that our present situation and the circumstances of Europe are such as require a greater force than can at all times be thought necessary for the defence of this Kingdom. Consequently the present debate does not nor can not turn on a question whether your Lordships ought or ought not to consent to the keeping up a standing army in time of peace in this Kingdom, but whether the present situation of England, considering that of the rest of Europe, can admit of the same measure to be taken with regard to a military force that would be proper in a season of absolute peace and tranquillity. For your Lordships' consideration seems to me to be, what deviation you shall think fit to make from those general rules and what augmentation of force the present circumstances of Europe, and the particular interests of this country now require.

But before I proceed ■ that consideration, since so much has been urged in general against the late increase of standing forces in this

1735 country, there is one thing in general too, and but one, that I will beg leave to observe to your Lordships in answer, and that is, though I am very ready to allow, and have allowed, the danger of great standing armies in time of peace in a free state, yet as the internal danger is not the single circumstance to be considered in limiting the number of standing forces in this island, but that the external danger of foreign invasions and sudden descents must also have its weight as our safety and security from annoyance from abroad must be provided for, as well as the danger of our liberties guarded against at home; and as no wise people will ever deprive themselves of the use of their natural strength to defend them from any attacks or insults from abroad, merely from an apprehension that if they collect that strength it may be turned against them by those who ought to exert it in their service; so I would beg leave to ask, whether any determinate number of forces can ever be said to be proper or improper to be kept up in this island merely and solely considering those forces with regard to liberty, and whether to determine what number is sufficient or insufficient it is not necessary to consider the circumstances of other powers abroad, which alone make any force at all necessary to be kept up for the security and defence of this country. And if that consideration be necessary, I would further ask (the military force of all the great powers on the Continent being so much altered, even in times of peace, within this last century) whether the same number of troops that were kept up by our ancestors a hundred years ago can be thought (though often prescribed as an example) sufficient to secure this nation in the present times, and whether the same policy that ever made it necessary to keep any troops on foot for our preservation and security against sudden attacks or invasion, does not make it necessary to increase that defence in proportion to the increase of force that made any precautions of defence ever necessary at all. I do not mean by this that if the forces of France (the power of which England from its vicinity has ever been most jealous) are increased from one hundred to two hundred thousand men, England ought to augment her force in the same degree, but in some proportion; for, as I know no way of resisting force but by force, so, if force be added to any power from whom you apprehend danger, I know no way of warding against that danger but by strengthening in the same proportion the force by which you hope to avert it.

The alteration of military force in Europe ought therefore in my humble opinion to alter in some degree the military force in this country, though I do not pretend to be able to calculate in what

degree that alteration ought to be proportioned to the augmentation abroad that makes any alteration here necessary. 1735

When I have said this, my Lords, with regard to standing armies in general in this country, I shall beg leave to consider the question before your Lordships with regard to the particular circumstances of the present most important and critical situation of affairs in Europe, which naturally leads me to the second argument of which I propose to take notice, which was the conduct of Holland on this occasion. And as that conduct has by the Lords who oppose this augmentation been insisted on so much as an example to England, I shall in the best manner I am able endeavour to show to your Lordships, how in my opinion that parallel stands, how far it does operate, and how far it ought to operate.

It has been said that no augmentation has been made by the Dutch and therefore why should England, whose interest is ultimately the same and whose danger is more remote, take alarm so much stronger than the Dutch and make augmentations and provisions which the Dutch think unnecessary.

In answer to this objection I beg, my Lords, in the first place to say that I thought it had been by everybody now known and understood that an augmentation, if not actually, at least virtually, has been made by the Dutch. For as 30,000 men in time of peace are thought a sufficient complement for the protection of their country, so 52,000 men being now kept up in Holland it does manifestly appear that 22,000 of those men are an augmentation of their forces on account of the present troubles, especially as every one knows that after the last treaty of Vienna the resolution was taken in Holland for making a reduction of these forces and that on the breaking out of the present troubles that resolution was laid aside.

What I have said, my Lords, with regard to this augmentation virtually made by the Dutch is founded upon facts undeniably true and universally known. For after the peace of Utrecht their forces were reduced to 30,000 men, till after the Hanover alliance they stood at that number, and were then increased to the present number at the time of the Hanover alliance. England, too, made an increase of 8,000 men, so that in the year 1727 both Dutch and English forces were upon the same foot as to the number that they now are. Upon the preliminary articles being signed England in the year 1728 made a reduction of 3,000 men, and upon the conclusion of the treaty of Seville England made a second reduction. What reduction did Holland make at this time? None; but on the con-

1735 trary complained of the reductions made by England as premature, and said, though the treaty of Seville was concluded, that no reduction of forces ought to be made till that treaty was executed or at least completed by the accession of the Emperor. According to the remonstrances no reduction, I say, was made by Holland, nor intended to be made, till after the second treaty of Vienna, which was looked upon by Holland as the completion of the treaty of Seville; and then indeed, as I said before, a reduction of 20,000 men was resolved upon to be made by Holland in two years at 10,000 men each year. But immediately after this resolution the present disturbances and troubles of Europe breaking out on the affair of Poland that resolution was laid aside. By the deduction therefore that I have made of the conduct of England and Holland with regard to augmenting or reducing their land-forces it does plainly appear that in ■■ augmentations they have gone hand in hand, or England followed Holland, whereas in every reduction of land-forces England has always taken the lead and often, unfollowed by Holland, acted alone.

And as to the answer made to this argument, that the virtual augmentation made by Holland, if allowed to be an augmentation made this year; indeed strictly speaking it is not, but then, my Lords, strictly speaking it may be said too that this augmentation made this year neither since the proposal now before your Lordships is only to confirm an augmentation already made the last year in consequence of the vote of confidence. And though I own, my Lords, such subtle distinctions are fit rather for the sophistry of logicians in schools than the deliberations of this assembly, yet as far as they have any weight on one side of the question, so far they will at least weigh on the other.

But the plain and fair state of this question with regard to a parallel between the conduct of England and Holland in an increase of land-forces certainly is whether on account of these troubles England has made an augmentation with these forces superior or even equal to the augmentation made by the Dutch, if the non-reduction is accounted an increase, which I think it ought to be.

Besides this, my Lords, with regard to making an augmentation this year of any forces either by sea or land, there ■ a very essential difference between the situation and circumstances of England and Holland; I mean on account of the treaty of neutrality by which Holland is bound and from which England is free. Should Holland, therefore, make any new preparations, it might give umbrage, it might give offence, and occasion complaints, as a step towards a

contravention of that treaty of neutrality, or at least as betraying 1735 some signs of an inclination not to observe it. But the case of England is very different, and a suspicion in France that these augmentations made by England are preparations for action and indications that England is not disposed to be an idle spectator of these ravages in Europe in case France should be unreasonable in her demands on the proposals of accommodation—such a suspicion, I say, my Lords, is a suspicion that England, not bound like Holland, instead of avoiding to give, ought to be glad to create.

Whether England would, could, or ought, to enter into the war without Holland would be an after question in the English councils, but thus much I will say. How improper so ever ■ may be for England to take that part of acting in anything separately from Holland, I am sure it is at least as improper before the time comes for the English Parliament to declare that she shall not take that part. For if France and her allies are to imagine that, let what will happen, England will not interpose provided Holland can be kept quiet, and if the English Parliament without an explicit declaration should give it to be understood that they would consent to no step to be taken by England but what was first taken by Holland, it would be making the council of the Hague, and not the English Parliament, the council of the King of England, and it would be making a declaration to all Europe that England should be governed so implicitly by Holland that if any foreign power had interest enough in Holland to influence the councils of the Hague they might depend on that influence equally operating in the councils of this country; which must of course tie up the hands of this country as effectually as if England had acceded to the treaty of neutrality and were under the same engagements with Holland to interpose in no exorbitant acquisitions of the allies that did not affect the Netherlands, how far so ever they might otherwise affect and overturn the balance of power in Europe.

And if this was to be so understood, what effect could be hoped from any proposal of accommodation? If France and the allies were to imagine that the Emperor would be unable alone to resist them; if Holland was thought unable and England unwilling; if both England and Holland together were to behave in such a manner that France and the allies should believe that these two great powers would in behalf of the Emperor oppose only paper to arms and negotiation to action; with how little weight must any mediation be proposed that did not answer every ambitious view that the most sanguine of the allies may have formed from the rapidity of their

1735 past conquests and the hope of no accession of strength being to be made to the power that without such accession they found unable to oppose them. Or how can it be imagined that the allies will ever listen to any terms but such as will be neither agreeable to the Emperor nor possible for him to accept, or to any terms indeed but such as would overturn the balance of power in Europe almost as effectually as any event of war?

If therefore all the maxims on which King William's war was undertaken, if all the principles on which Queen Anne's war was prosecuted, are not exploded, if the balance of power in Europe is thought necessary to be preserved and that the maritime powers alone can poise that balance, how is it possible in the present circumstances of Europe, if England and Holland or neither of them are in a condition to prevent it, but that it must be overturned?

I am now come in the last place to consider the unintelligible conduct of England (as it has been called) both in this augmentation and in every other step she has taken since these troubles began. And notwithstanding all that has been said to deprecate the conduct of England and to animadvert on her manner of proceeding, notwithstanding everything that has been urged to make her intentions in some points unaccountable and her offers in most points useless, to my apprehension, my Lords, her conduct appears uniform, consistent, prudent, and reasonable; and the plain meaning of everything England, since these troubles began, has either said or done, seems to be to tell the Court of Vienna that England not acknowledging this war to be *casus fœderis*, since began on the account of Poland, she did not think fit immediately to send to the Emperor the succours demanded, as if due by treaty, but did offer her good offices to accommodate the present differences and restore the public tranquillity. On the other hand the language England had held at the Court of France appears to be such as should give France to understand that, though we have not sent succours to the Emperor as due to him by treaty, yet, if France should persist in weakening the Emperor so far as to endanger the *équilibre* of Europe, that England would think herself bound at last in interest to give the Emperor that assistance which she did not think herself obliged at first to afford him by any articles of treaty.

It is in this light, my Lords, that I see the conduct of England and it is upon this foot that I approve the measures of those who have hitherto kept England out of this war and are notwithstanding for putting England in a capacity, if the fatal exigency of affairs should require it, to act that part which I agree the utmost necessity alone

should oblige England to take, yet one which an inability to take, if necessary, would bring this nation into a worse situation and expose it to greater dangers than even the *unadvisable* step of taking a part before it become absolutely necessary, as the taking a part before it was absolutely necessary would only put the nation to a useless expense, whilst an inability to act when it was absolutely necessary must be total ruin. 1735

If then that time should come when the maritime powers should think themselves obliged to take a part, the Dutch by the 52,000 men they have on foot would be prepared immediately on such emergency to act, whereas England without this augmentation would not be prepared. And if in answer to this it should be said that whenever the case did exist new levies might immediately be made, I must own for my own part I have so an opinion of the immediate efficacy of new levies, from what I have heard said by those who are much better judges than I pretend to be of military affairs, that, however successful formerly in other states generals taken from the plough may have been, I should be very sorry to see the balance of Europe or the defence of this country depend on troops composed of men taken immediately from cultivating the land into the employment of defending it by arms, and those who would advise this country, in the present impending danger, to wait till the hour came that troops were absolutely necessary for immediate use, and to trust like Pompey to the sudden stamp of a foot for troops to flow in to our aid, would in my opinion so advise this nation as to make it by Pompey's measures incur Pompey's fate and be ruined for want of precaution when nothing but that want could ruin it.

If, therefore, it is said that this preparation of troops, till it is seen whether the plan of accommodation shall succeed or not, is a needless expense to the nation, because if it does succeed the troops will be useless, I beg leave to turn it the other way. I hope they will be useless, but their being ready in case there was occasion for them perhaps may be the most probable way for there being no occasion for them. But supposing the efficacy of these troops in that light out of the question, if the option lay merely between the possibility of having them without wanting them or wanting them without having them where all that is valuable to us might come to be at stake, which of these two inconveniences ought this nation, or any other in such circumstances, in common prudence to run the risk of incurring?

As to the argument made use of, in contradiction to this measure, of saving the public money till the time comes for its being absolutely necessary to expend it, I must answer that an ill-timed economy has

1735 often cost nations as well as particulars treble in futurity what they spared in present. Whether the present case comes within the description of such unprovident economists (paradoxical as that expression may sound) is matter of opinion and judgment, but I must observe to your Lordships that the same arguments have always formerly been used against all the preventive expenses that have been made, and yet all those former preventive expenses have answered the end proposed. And when those who reason indiscriminately from circumstances on this chapter argue that money is the sinews of war, I beg leave to say that maxim, taken in so unbounded a sense, at all times is, in my humble opinion, a maxim ill-founded in theory, and has often been refuted by practice. It was a maxim first started by an author as romantic in many of his maxims as his facts, and often of course equally erroneous in both, for good troops have often found money, though money has not always found good troops. Without going a great way for examples, did not the Russians find money last year at Danzig? Did not the Swedes find money under Charles XII in Saxony? And if I may be allowed ■ go further back to the history of other ages and other countries, if money be the sinews of war and the unfailing earnest of victory, how came the Lydians, the richest people then in the known world, to be conquered by the Persians who were then poor? And how came those Persians, when they became rich, to be afterwards subdued by the Macedonians? How came the Spartans, who were the poorest state in all Greece, to be a match for the Athenians, who were the most opulent? How came the Greeks to be vanquished by the Romans? How came the Carthaginians destroyed by them? And how came the Asiatic Kings under their dominion? How came the Goths and the Gauls at different times without money to make their way by conquest in every part of the world to which they turned their arms? If I spoke not only from memory the instances would be endless that might be produced to refute this ill-founded maxim of money being the sinews of war and victory always accompanying riches, and in my humble opinion, my Lords, this is so very far from being true, that a people who have only riches and money enough to be envied by their neighbours, and not force and strength sufficient to be dreaded by them, are in greater danger than if they were less rich and less flourishing; and must if they are not in a condition to be feared, be in a situation to fear.

Nor is any argument to be drawn from the vast expenses France has been at and the vast losses she has sustained, of her being willing on any terms to consent to peace. For if no additional force was

apprehended by France to assist those she has overrun, from the 1735
same way of reasoning I have just made use of, that good and conquering troops will find money, France would find supplies out of the countries she would be permitted to overrun. For, though the beginning of doubtful wars is always expensive to both parties, the progress of victorious arms makes successful wars in a great measure bear their own charges; and for this reason that mediation is likeliest to succeed, that comes at a time when each party has in some degree impaired its vigour and neither party is in such despair as to make the other unreasonable.

The economy in raising these troops is a point I intended to touch, but it has been spoken to already, and I have troubled your Lordships too long to add anything more than saying that for these reasons I am for the greater number of troops, for the preamble to this bill standing unaltered, and consequently against the instruction to the Committee moved by the Noble Lord who spoke first.

After this, the question was put and the greater number of forces voted by a majority of two, yet I cannot help confessing that a more unreasonable vote, in my humble opinion, was never passed, as that short argument of these troops being too many if England was not to be engaged in the war, and too few if she was, seems to me unanswerable, I am sure at least it was unanswered.

But the true reason for taking this measure was that Sir Robert Walpole, who would willingly have spared himself both the unpopularity of keeping up so large a body of forces, and the trouble of finding money to defray so great and unnecessary an expense, was obliged to give in to this measure in order to flatter the military genius of the King, who was always as insatiably covetous of troops as money, thought he could never have enough of either, and could seldom be prevailed with to part with either, though he had more of both than he had any occasion to employ, or any use for further than to review the one and count the other; and as His Majesty was vehemently for taking a part in this war, his Minister had no way of keeping him out of it but by this composition, which was the putting the means of war into his hands at

1735 the same time that he tied them up from using them, and giving His Majesty the satisfaction of brandishing a sword in the scabbard which he would not permit him to draw.

In this manner was this great and able statesman often obliged to purchase great points by yielding in small ones, and of course incurred the imputation of acting injudiciously in things which, abstractedly considered, he certainly could not justify, but, weighed with their connection to other matters which he could not have brought about but upon these conditions, were so far from being any reflection on his conduct, that they were proofs of his skill; and if men may now and then be allowed in policy to deviate a little from that injunction in the Gospel of not doing evil that good may come of it, there was hardly any measure ever taken with regard to the army (excepting that number of troops raised by his timidity the election-year) which I do not think I could account for without Sir Robert Walpole's being really to blame.

There was one negative circumstance which favoured his endeavours to prevent the King and Queen involving England this year in the war which I must not omit to relate, and that was M. Hatolf's being so ill all winter that he could not once come to the Queen to blow that militant flame in Her Majesty which Sir Robert, with all the political buckets he was continually throwing upon it, could never quite extinguish, though he kept it from blazing out in the vehement manner she wished to let it rage.

The expenses for the current service of this year, even without going into the war, were very great, amounting to no less than £3,250,000:

Land-tax at 2s. in the pound	-	-	£1,000,000
The Sinking Fund	-	-	1,000,000
Malt-tax	-	-	750,000
Borrowed on the salt-duty	-	-	500,000
			<hr/>
			£3,250,000

Which sum, added to £2,000,000 that went to the pay- 173.
ment of the interest of the National Debt, and including
also the revenue of the King's Civil List, reckoned at
but £800,000, together with £1,500,000 at least raised
by the poor's tax, makes £7,550,000 which was raised
this year by this poor, indigent, undone nation (as I hear
it every day called) for the annual services. Not that I
would be thought by what I am saying to approve the
conduct of those who make this country in time of peace
pay these vast sums for its annual support, any more than
I do the nonsense of those either ignorant or hypocritical
lamenters who talk of our being ruined. I think the practice
of the one as false policy as I think the assertions of the
other false theory; for if this country in all its prosperity,
and after five-and-twenty years' peace, is but two millions
in fifty less in debt than it was at the determination of
Queen Anne's war, I cannot but acknowledge that to my
weak understanding the economy of the Government in
its domestic calling does not seem to me to have been very
laudably exercised; nor do I at all approve the situation
which, according to this way of acting (if continued), this
nation must ever be in, and that is, that in time of war its
debts are always to be increased, and in time of peace
never to be lessened.

To look, therefore, upon the situation of England at
present in a true light, at least as I conceive its situation
to be, and to reduce it to the parallel circumstances of a
single private person (which kind of familiar instances
tend always to illustrate these sort of cases), I consider
England in its present circumstances not in the least as a
necessitous bankrupt who has neither money enough to
pay his creditors nor to provide for his own subsistence,
as it is represented by the ignorant, the irritating, and the
clamorous, to serve private ends and gratify personal
pique—but I look upon England at present as a man in
vast affluence, who inherits and possesses a large estate
chargeable with a great debt, and tenant for life only in

1735 that estate, without a power to raise more money, or very little more, upon it than that with which it already stands charged; and though this estate yields him a produce sufficient to pay the interest of that debt, and to live in great ease, magnificence, credit, and expense at the same time, yet, as his constant way of living calls for the whole surplus of his revenue after the interest of the debt is paid, so, in case of any exigence or contingent call for any sum of money, I look upon him under an absolute incapacity of providing for such wants without either retrenching his former expenses in some article, or making himself extremely uneasy as long as he lives; and as it is full as improbable that any country should for ever be in a condition that will not call for greater expenses than are necessary in a state of profound peace as it is to suppose that many generations should follow one another without some demands upon their estates of the nature of those I have enumerated, so I hold it to be very bad economy and the highest imprudence for any government to persist in keeping up its expenses to the full stretch of its purse in those seasons when it ought to be discharging the debts contracted by former extravagances, and providing for the charge of future necessities. Yet this imprudence is indisputably our case at present, since, as far as I am master of the state of our debts and expenses of our annual disbursements, and our power to augment the revenue, I do not see how it would be possible, on any exigence, or for the support of the most necessary war, for England to raise above £1,000,000 a year more than it now raises,¹ which would be by increasing the land-tax from 2s. to 4s. in the pound.

And there is one circumstance that reflects very strongly on the economy of our present governors, which, as I am

¹What would my father have said had he lived to these days, 1777, and seen seventeen millions raised in a year?—*Note by the third Earl.*

What would either have said to our raising for 1846, a year of peace, fifty-three millions?—*Croker.*

determined to give my opinion impartially on every sub- 1735
ject treated in these papers, I will not pass over in silence;
and that is, that the nation now annually pays more for
the current service of the year, without being engaged in
the present war, than it did during the first two or three
years when it was a principal in King William's and Queen
Anne's wars.

I, therefore, am far from justifying the prudential part
of taking the Sinking Fund for the current service in the
manner it has lately been done, though I have, both in
public and private, justified the loyalty of it.

The public has certainly a right to dispose of those
surpluses called the Sinking Fund, after the interest of
the national debt is paid, in what manner the public thinks
fit, as those surpluses are, by the words of the Acts of
Parliament which constitute the contract between the
public and the creditors of the public, absolutely and
explicitly reserved for the future disposition of Parliament;
and when the clause in one of these Acts, called the
General Fund Act, does dispose of these surpluses as fast
as they arise for the payment of part of the principal of the
national debts incurred before the year 1716, it is very
evident that the Parliament in that case acts as a steward
for the public, and not as a contractor for the public; that
its acts are consequently only declaratory and prudential
for itself, not obligatory and binding upon future Parliaments;
and can no more be construed to tie down future
Parliaments than any other Act made by Parliament,
which is merely discretionary, not bargaining, and consequently
revocable, alterable, and rescindable, by any
future Parliament.¹

At the end of this Session of Parliament the Scripture
parable was reversed; for the harvest of Court favours was
small and the labourers were many, there being many
Lords and Commoners who were very desirous to reap

¹Lord Carteret's and Lord Hervey's speeches on the Sinking Fund.
—*Note by Lord Hervey.*

1735 those favours, and but two employments to be disposed of—that of Privy Seal, vacated by the resignation of Lord Lonsdale, and that of Secretary-at-War, that became void by the dismissal of Sir William Strickland, who had already kept the office above a year longer than he was capable of doing the duty of it, and was now become so weak in mind as well as body, that his head was as much in its second infancy as his limbs.

Lord Lonsdale, when he resigned the Privy Seal, declared, not only to the King but to everybody else, that he quitted from no personal disgust either to his Master or his Ministers, nor any disapprobation either of their foreign or domestic measures, but merely on account of his health and his natural love for retirement, both which made him equally unfit for living in town or about a Court. He was a speculative, splenetic, honest man, who always wanted to make practice tally with theory, and, as he was out of humour with the world when he could not, I need not add that he was seldom pleased; and, as melancholy people who study books of physic and anatomy are apt to fancy they have every distemper they read of, and that their own body, from the delicacy of its texture, is in danger of falling to pieces every time they stir a leg or an arm, so this theoretic Lord, from a natural gloom in his temper that made him see everything in a much deeper shade than cheerful eyes would ever have beheld them, in ruminating on the corruption of the present times, and the disaffection of the nation to the present Royal Family, used to foresee nothing but tumults, seditions, insurrections, rebellions, revolutions; and would often say to those who were in his confidence that, as it was impossible for things to hold together upon the foot they now were, and that approaching confusion must soon be the lot of his poor unfortunate country, so he desired to retire out of a world which he was unable to mend, unfit to bustle in, and unwilling to see torn to pieces; adding, on these occasions, that England was brought to the dilemma of

being undone by the expenses of war, if it took that part; 1735
or by the turbulence of faction, luxury, and corruption,
if it remained in the inactivity of peace. These reflections,
he said, joined to very ill-health, made him so unhappy
whilst he remained a near spectator of these impending
misfortunes, that he was determined to go abroad, in
order to mend the one and to remove the disagreeable
prospect of the other, and, accordingly, soon after he
went into the south of France. His brother, too, who very
unreasonably thought his merit superior to an employment
of £1,000 a year in Ireland, and for that reason quitted it,
contributed to strengthen these opinions, hoping that
his brother's dislike of things would grow into a dislike
of persons, and that he should blow him up to be an enemy
to those whom his own vanity had induced him to think
had not been enough his friends.

Lord Lonsdale's employment was given immediately *May 14*
to Lord Godolphin, not from a desire in the King to show
him favour, but from a principle of economy; for by this
means the King saved a pension of £3,000 a year, which
Lord Godolphin had enjoyed ever since he quitted the
employment of Groom of the Stole.

Sir William Yonge was made Secretary-at-War, which
left a vacancy in the Treasury. Lord Hervey pressed Sir
Robert Walpole extremely to put his friend Mr. Winnington
into the vacancy, which would have made one in the
Admiralty, where Mr. Campbell, another of his friends,
would of course have come in. The Duke of Newcastle
and Mr. Pelham solicited the Treasury for Mr. Clutter-
buck, and Sir Robert Walpole, not caring to decide between
these two, put in neither, which, in my opinion, was at
this time one of the most impolitic unministerial acts I
ever knew him guilty of.

Winnington's pretensions were certainly superior every
way to Clutterbuck's. He was his senior in the Admiralty,
and besides that was, from his party-knowledge and appli-
cation, of infinite use to Sir Robert Walpole in the House

1735 of Commons. Clutterbuck was sensible, beloved, and had a good character, but was lazy, indolent, and mute, and of no use in Parliament but counting one in a division.

The way that Sir Robert Walpole took to avoid disobliging one of these two men disobliged them both, for he took his son-in-law, Lord Cholmondeley, into the Treasury; and though neither of them could complain of Lord Cholmondeley's being preferred to them, yet both of them saw he was put there only to avoid a decision between their claims.

The reason Sir Robert gave for putting Lord Cholmondeley there was that his Lordship was so uneasy in the Prince's service, and had so long pressed him to be removed out of it, that it was impossible for him longer to withstand that solicitation, especially since it was upon his account Lord Cholmondeley was so ill-used by the Prince; nor could he, with any decency to the Prince, take Lord Cholmondeley out of his service upon any pretence but that of putting him into a place of business; for which reason, when the King had offered to make Lord Cholmondeley a Lord of his Bedchamber, Lord Cholmondeley had declined it. By this odd measure, therefore, of putting Lord Cholmondeley into the Treasury, the Prince was disobliged, by Lord Cholmondeley quitting his service; the King was disobliged, because he had declined the Bedchamber; Mr. Winnington and Mr. Clutterbuck were disobliged, because their hopes of the Treasury were defeated; and Campbell was disobliged, because, after ten years' service, an opportunity of providing for him offered and was not taken.

Lord Hervey remonstrated to Sir Robert Walpole against this step, for all these accumulated reasons; adding that Sir Robert was always feeling the weight of all the young men in the House of Commons taking a part against him, and yet on every occasion showed that they could get nothing by being attached to him. Sir Robert said that it was not his fault that there were not more things in

his gift. To which Lord Hervey answered, that was very 1735 true; but it was a fault not only to his friends but even to himself if he did not make the best disposition he could of those favours that were in his power; and added further, that, let him be ever so able a Minister, it was impossible for him to alter universal principles in human nature, and the fundamental inducements of mankind not only to serve one another but even to serve Heaven itself; that the strength of all government, like the foundation of all religions, was rewards and punishments; and that the one was as necessary to encourage one's friends and keep them firm, as the other was to intimidate one's enemies and keep them quiet. "But, Sir," continued he, "if I may take the liberty to say so, you are at present breaking through both these rules by showing the world that your known and almost avowed enemies may be your enemies with impunity, and enjoy the best employments in the kingdom; whilst your friends have nothing to reward them but that unpopularity which always attends serving power, without the profit that should be annexed to it; and if Mr. Campbell and Mr. Fox, after serving you seven years for that disagreeable Leah, are to serve you seven more for Rachel, who among the youth that has his senses, if he thinks of his interest (and I believe you have lived too long in the world and in power to expect people should embark in any party without thinking of it) will ever list in your service with such a prospect and such examples before their eyes?"

Sir Robert said all this was very true, but that Lord Hervey knew he had always declared Mr. Campbell and Mr. Fox should be the two first people he would provide for; that he thought them not only useful but creditable friends, as their integrity was not inferior to their understandings, nor their characters to their fortunes. "But, my Lord, you see my difficulty: Campbell could not be brought into the Admiralty without Winnington or Clutterbuck being removed, and one of those could not be removed

1735 without the other being lost. I am inclined to Winnington, but you know I am the only friend (yourself excepted) he has in the Court, and that both the King and Queen have great prejudices against him."

"One of these things," replied Lord Hervey, "is the consequence of the other. He has no friend in the palace but you, because he has attached himself to nobody but you; and the people who are angry he has made court only to you are those who have given the King and Queen those prejudices against him; so that I think you in honour and justice, and indeed in interest (unless you will let people know it is not safe to attach themselves wholly to you), bound to remove any ill impressions that may have been given of Winnington at Court, since you must know that their being made so strong has proceeded chiefly from his being so strongly and undividedly your humble servant." "As to what you said" (interrupted Sir Robert Walpole) "about my enemies being such with impunity, I have told Dodington this very morning that I will no longer bear his shuffling, fast-and-loose conduct, and will rather risk the entering into the next session of Parliament with a majority only of forty or fifty than go on in this way; I desired, therefore, we might understand one another, and he has, with the greatest submission, promised everything I could require with regard to his future good behaviour. As for the Duke of Dorset, I have got the Queen at last to consent to remove him from his Lieutenancy in Ireland. Lord Scarborough I design should succeed him, and your friend Mr. Fox, if he likes it, shall go Secretary; but though I commission you to propose this to him, it is under the injunction of the strictest secrecy, for neither the Duke of Dorset yet knows he is to quit this employment, nor Lord Scarborough that he is to have it."

Sir Robert Walpole, in order to raise the value to Lord Hervey of what he had cut out for his friend Mr. Fox, told him the employment of Secretary was worth £2000 a year, which it was not by near the half. However, nothing

else offering, Lord Hervey advised Mr. Fox to accept it, 1735 and he did so; but when the offer of the Lieutenancy was made to Lord Scarborough, to the great surprise of Sir Robert Walpole, as well as of the King and Queen, he refused it; acknowledging at the same time, great obligations for the honour they had done him in offering it; but saying it was impossible he could expose his character to the censure of the world so far as to give any handle for a suspicion or insinuation that he had quitted his employment one year only in order to get a more profitable one the next.

But what was more extraordinary still than Lord Scarborough's refusal of this great post, was that it never took air that the offer of it had been made to him; and the Duke of Dorset went to Ireland again as satisfied with his own security as if he had owed it to his own strength.

Sir Robert Walpole took a little ill the strong manner in which Lord Hervey had pressed Mr. Winnington and Mr. Campbell's advancement on this occasion; and Lord Hervey certainly went much further than he would have done had he known, as he did afterwards, that the measure of putting Lord Cholmondeley into the Treasury was at that time unalterably resolved upon.

Winnington's rough behaviour to Sir Robert Walpole on the disappointment did Lord Hervey, who had appeared so zealous for him, still more hurt, and himself no good. Mr. Clutterbuck's resentment went so far that he absented himself entirely from Sir Robert Walpole; and Winnington was going on in the same simple middle way with Mr. Clutterbuck—that is, voting in public with Sir Robert, and talking in private against him—when Lord Hervey insisted on his making the option of either quitting his employment and being thoroughly disobliged, or keeping it and being thoroughly reconciled. He advised the last, and his advice was followed.

This being the third summer since the King's last journey to Hanover, and this triennial journey one among

1735 the many things which the King continued to do because he had once done them, His Majesty declared, a little before the Parliament rose, his intention of visiting, as soon as it should rise, his foreign dominions. His Ministers in England were one and all extremely desirous to divert His Majesty from this resolution, but did not succeed. It is certain it would have been much for the despatch as well as for the convenience of foreign negotiations, which were likely to be the chief business of this summer, that the King should have remained in England, in order to prevent every paper, which in that case might be regulated by a short journey only from Sir Robert Walpole's house at Chelsea to the King's palace at Kensington, being obliged to make a voyage or two from England to Hanover before it could be settled. Neither would it have been a very agreeable incident for the King of Great Britain, after a month's residence at Hanover, to be running back again through Westphalia to England with seventy thousand Prussians at his heels; and yet, considering the terms he and the King of Prussia were upon at present, this might easily have happened, and was suggested by Sir Robert Walpole to deter His Majesty from this expedition. But to their remonstrances His Majesty always answered, "Pooh!" and "Stuff!" or, "You think to get the better of me, but you shall not"; and, in short, plainly showed that all efforts to divert him from this expedition would be fruitless.

The English Ministers apprehended, too, that if the King went into Germany, his German Ministers, being all of them Imperialists, might make the difficulties of keeping His Majesty out of the war, in case the proposition for peace did not take place, still more troublesome and harder to be surmounted than they had hitherto found them, which might be of fatal consequence when the English Ministers, by experience, knew their influence was barely a match for such difficulties even in their former degree, and combated on this side of the water.

But that which prevented the English Ministers from 1735
succeeding in their attempts to prevent His Majesty's
intended journey, in my opinion, was the Queen, through
whom they chiefly worked, not being heartily desirous
they should succeed. Not that Her Majesty could not
foresee some inconveniences in his going, but the danger
of blowing up his warlike disposition, which was one of the
things that alarmed our Ministers the most, disturbed
her the least; and to compensate the trouble of transacting
all business with him at that distance by letter, she had
the pleasure that resulted to her pride from the éclat of the
regency, and the convenience and ease of being mistress
of all those hours that were not employed in writing, to do
what she pleased, which was never her case for two hours
together when the King was in England; and besides these
agréments, she had the certainty of being, for six months
at least, not only free from the conjugal fatigue of being
obliged to entertain him twenty hours in the twenty-four,
but also from the more irksome office of being set up to
receive the quotidian sallies of a temper that, let it be
charged by what hand it would, used always to discharge
its hottest fire, on some pretence or other, upon her.

But there was one trouble arose on the King's going to
Hanover which Her Majesty did not at all foresee, which
was his becoming, soon after his arrival, so much attached
to one Madame Walmoden, a young married woman of
the first fashion at Hanover, that nobody in England
talked of anything but the declining power of the Queen,
and the growing interest of this new favourite. By what
I could perceive of the Queen I think her pride was much
more hurt on this occasion than her affections, and that
she was much more uneasy from thinking people imagined
her interest declining than from apprehending it was so.

It is certain, too, that, from the very beginning of this
new engagement, the King acquainted the Queen by
letter of every step he took in it, of the growth of his
passion, the progress of his applications, and their success,

1735 of every word as well as every action that passed—so minute a description of her person, that had the Queen been a painter she might have drawn her rival's picture at six hundred miles' distance. He added, too, the account of his buying her, and what he gave her, which, considering the rank of the purchaser, and the merits of the purchase as he set them forth, I think he had no great reason to brag of, when the first price, according to his report, was only one thousand ducats—a much greater proof of his economy than his passion.

But notwithstanding all the Queen's philosophy on this occasion, when she found the time for the King's return put off so late in the year that for six weeks together the orders for the yacht were by every post and courier in vain expected, she grew extremely uneasy, and, by the joy she showed when the orders arrived, plainly manifested that she had felt more anxiety than she had suffered to appear whilst they were deferred.

Yet all this while the King, besides his ordinary letters by the post, never failed sending a courier once a week with a letter of sometimes sixty pages, and never less than forty, filled with an hourly account of everything he saw, heard, thought, or did, and crammed with minute trifling circumstances, not only unworthy of a man to write, but even of a woman to read, most of which I saw, and almost all of them heard reported by Sir Robert, to whose perusal few were not committed, and many passages in them were transmitted to him by the King's own order, who used to tag several paragraphs with "*Montrez ceci et consultez là-dessus le gros homme.*" Among many extraordinary things and expressions these letters contained, there was one in which he desired the Queen to contrive, if she could, that the Prince of Modena, who was to come the latter end of the year to England, might bring his wife with him; and the reason he gave for it was, that he heard Her Highness was pretty free of her person, and that he had the greatest inclination imaginable to pay his addresses to

a daughter of the late Regent of France, the Duke of Orleans—"un plaisir," ajouta-t'il, for he wrote always in French, "que je suis sûr, ma chère Caroline, vous serez bien aise de me procurer, quand je vous dis combien je le souhaite."

The ridicule of this request to his wife for a woman he never saw, and during his engagement with Madame Walmoden, is a ridicule of that sort that speaks itself much stronger in a bare narrative of the fact than by any comment or reflections; and is as incapable of being heightened as difficult to be credited.

In order to give an account of the posture of foreign affairs during this summer, it is necessary for me to go a little back.

On the 17th of February, 1735, the long-expected plan of accommodation was at last delivered out to the Ministers of the several Courts whose interests were concerned in it, and the principal articles of it were these:

That Stanislaus should keep the title of King of Poland, and renounce all pretensions to the kingdom.

That the Russians should be withdrawn from Poland, on the Elector of Saxony's being acknowledged King.

That the Emperor should yield the kingdoms of Naples and Sicily to Don Carlos; and to the King of Sardinia the Tortoneze, the Novarresa, and Vigevanasso, which should be detached from the Milanese and annexed to Piedmont. That France and the Allies, on the other hand, should restore everything they had taken elsewhere during the war from the Emperor and the Empire, Don Carlos at the same time giving up all his pretensions on the duchies of Tuscany, Parma, and Placentia to the Emperor, the town of Leghorn excepted, which should remain a free port, and dependent only on its own magistrates, the rights and privileges of commerce there being secured to the English and the Dutch, as in the reign of Charles II. of Spain.

1735 That France should guarantee the Pragmatic Sanction; Spain renew that guarantee which she had already made; and the King of Sardinia be included therein.

This plan concluded with a little sort of a hint to the powers at war that, if it was not accepted, the maritime powers would be obliged to take some part in the war if those powers would allow them no share in making a peace; and as some readers may have a curiosity to see the plan at full length, I have annexed a copy of it in French, according to its original draught.

PROJET D'ACCOMMODEMENT OU DE PACIFICATION

Qu'en suite de l'acceptation de l'offre de leurs bons offices le Roi de la Grande Bretagne et les Etats Généraux proposent aux puissances engagées dans la présente guerre.

Il n'est pas nécessaire, pour le but que S. M. Br. et L. H. P. se proposoient dans ce projet, d'examiner scrupuleusement si les brouilleries que la vacance du trône de Pologne a fait naître sont le principal, sinon l'unique, motif de la présente guerre, ou si elles n'en sont pas la cause accidentelle, mais il est seulement nécessaire de faire les deux observations suivantes:

La première, que dans l'état présent des affaires on travailleroit inutilement à un accommodement entre les puissances qui sont en guerre, sans commencer par la Pologne.

La seconde, qu'il est évident à quiconque réfléchit avec un peu d'attention sur la nature des brouilleries que la vacance du trône de Pologne a fait naître et sur l'état présent de ce royaume, que pour terminer par un accommodement ces brouilleries, ■ est absolument nécessaire d'éviter les discussions du droit et de plusieurs difficultés de même nature.

Après ces deux observations préliminaires, S. M. Br. et L. H. P. se croient en droit d'avancer que le plus apparent, sinon le seul et unique, expédient pour terminer ces brouilleries d'une manière propre à guérir les inquiétudes de l'Empereur et de la Russie, et ■ sauver en même temps l'honneur de la France et du Roi Stanislas, et pour frayer le chemin au retour si désirable de la paix générale, par l'éloignement d'un obstacle si capitale, est que le Roy Stanislas, du consentement du Roi T. C. son beau fils, déclare par un acte en due forme, adressé à la nation polonoise ses sujets, que préférant dans son

âge avancé le repos et la tranquillité de la vie privée à tout ce que le monde a de plus brillant, après avoir satisfait à ce qu'en qualité de Roi de Pologne il se devoit à soi même et à ses fidèles sujets, il renonce librement et volontairement à la couronne de Pologne, et déclare les polonois ses sujets dégagés et libres du serment de fidélité qu'ils luy ont prêté ou dû prêter comme à leur légitime Roy, dans la ferme attente que toute l'Europe, et surtout que le Roi T. C. dont il a l'honneur d'être le beau père, approuvera cette démarche, qui tend visiblement à calmer les troubles de Pologne et à ramener la paix entre les puissances qui à cette occasion se font la guerre. Mais sachant combien les matières dans lesquelles il s'agit de l'honneur, surtout de l'honneur des souverains, sont délicates, S. M. Br. et L. H. P. n'ouvrent cet expédient, tout plausible qu'il leur paroît, qu'aux conditions, ou avec restrictions, suivantes :

1. Que le Roi Stanislas conservera les titres de Roi de Pologne et du Grand Duché de Lithuanie, avec tous les honneurs et prérogatives qui sont attachés à ces augustes titres et à ce rang, qui lui seront rendus en quelque pays qu'il se retire;

2. Que ce prince aura la libre jouissance de ses biens et de ceux de la Reine, son épouse;

3. Qu'il y aura une amnistie de tout le passé par rapport aux troubles présents pour toutes personnes, de quelque qualité, rang et condition qu'elle soient, et notamment que toutes les provinces et villes, et en particulier celle de Danzig, où le Roi Stanislas s'est retiré depuis son élection, seront rétablies et maintenues dans le même état où elles se trouvoient avant la naissance des troubles présents par rapport à leurs droits, libertés, privilèges, honneurs et dignités, et qu'immédiatement après l'abdication le fond de Weyxelmünde sera rendu à la ville de Danzig, à laquelle pareillement le reste de la taxe qui lui avoit été imposée par les Saxons sera remis. Les articles contenant lesdites conditions seront insérés dans les susdits actes et en feront une partie essentielle et, pour en assurer l'exécution, la partie adverse, qui se qualifie du nom de la République Confédérée, ou bien la Diette de Pacification, si elle est assemblée, lorsque le Roi Stanislas publiera son abdication, lui enverra une députation solennelle pour le remercier du sacrifice qu'il veut bien faire de ses propres intérêts les plus précieux au repos et à la tranquillité de sa patrie, et pour lui remettre un acte d'acceptation, dans lequel lesdits articles seront insérés ; et faute de cela l'abdication du Roi Stanislas sera censée nulle et comme non faite.

Comme elle sera aussi réputée nulle et comme non faite, si les troupes russiennes ne se retirent pas de la Pologne et du grand

1735 Duché de Lithuanie immédiatement après la publication desdits actes d'abdication.

Ensuite le Roi Stanislas le notifiera à tous les princes à qui il a notifié son élection; et tant l'Empereur que S. M. B. et L. H. P., dans leur réponses aux lettres de notification, le reconnoîtront pour Roi de Pologne, conformément au susdit acte renonçant à la couronne, et s'emploieront auprès des autres puissances leurs amies et alliés afin qu'elles en fassent autant.

Attendu que les troubles de Pologne sont la principale source de la présente guerre, toutes les puissances belligérantes, pour contribuer autant qu'il dépend d'elles audit accommodement, la garantiront et même emploieront leurs bons offices auprès de l'Impératrice de Russie pour que de son côté elle fasse la même chose, et pour qu'elle retire incessamment après l'abdication du Roi Stanislas ses troupes de Pologne, le tout afin que les Polonois jouissent tranquillement et sans contrainte des libertés et prérogatives de leurs constitutions et particulièrement de la libre élection de leur Roi.

Et finalement, s'il arrivoit, contre toute apparence, que pendant le cours de la négociation pour l'acceptation du présent plan d'accocomodement les raisons qui font regarder l'abdication du Roi Stanislas comme le plus apparent, et non le seul et unique, expédient pour terminer à l'amiable les brouilleries de Pologne, vinssent à cesser par quelque incident imprévu, le reste des préliminaires n'en demeurera pas moins en son entier.

Les événements de la guerre, dont la France a dès le commencement porté le fort en Italie, ayant fait tomber entre les mains de la France et de ses alliés les principaux états que l'Empereur possédait en ce pais-la avant la guerre, conformément au derniers traités de paix, l'Empereur, animé d'un désir sincère de procurer à l'Europe une paix stable et solide, cédera à l'Infant Don Carlos les royaumes de Naples et de Sicile, comme aussi il cédera au Roi de Sardaigne, Tortone et le Tortonois, Navarre et le Navarrois, et le Vigevanasco, pour être détachés du Duché de Milan et faire à l'avenir un corps avec le Piémont, avec pouvoir au Roi de Sardaigne de fortifier lesdites places, aussi bien que toutes les autres frontières qu'il trouvera nécessaires pour la défense de ses états; bien entendu et à condition expresse que la France et ses alliés restitueront de bonne foi tout ce que d'ailleurs ils ont pris à l'Empereur ou à l'Empire pendant la présente guerre; et que l'Infant Don Carlos de son côté cédera à l'Empereur tous ses droits sur la Toscane et les Duchés de Parme et de Plaisance pour être possédés par l'Empereur en pleine propriété, à l'exception notamment de la ville de Livorne, laquelle

pour ■ liberté du commerce sera une ville et port libre et indé- 1735
pendant de tout autre souverain que de ses propres magistrats; et par
dessus cela l'Infant Don Carlos s'engagera en qualité de Roi de
Naples et de Sicile, que le commerce des sujets de S. M. Br. et de
L. H. P. y sera incessamment rétabli et maintenu à tous égards sur
le pié qu'il étoit du vivant de Charles Second, Roi d'Espagne de
glorieuse mémoire; et d'autant que l'Empereur ne pourra pas
prendre possession de la Toscane, ni en tirer des revenus, pendant
■ vie du Grand Duc.

Et qu'entre-temps l'Infant Don Carlos jouira des royaumes de
Naples et de Sicile, on conviendra dans la négociation d'un dédom-
magement en argent en faveur de l'Empereur durant la vie du
Grand Duc.

Comme la conservation de l'équilibre des puissances dont dépend
le repos de toute l'Europe demande absolument l'indivisibilité des
états de la maison d'Autriche, la France, animée du même désir avec
l'Empereur de procurer à l'Europe une paix stable et solide, garan-
tira la pragmatique sanction de l'année 1713 de la même manière
que d'autres puissances l'ont déjà garantie, et par conséquent cette
garantie ne regardera que les états que l'Empereur possède actuelle-
ment, et qu'il possédera conformément à ce plan d'accommodement,
sans y comprendre ceux sur lesquels lui ou sa maison pourroit
former des prétentions, ou que lui ou ses successeurs pourroient
acquérir par succession, mariage ou autrement. Puisque l'Espagne a
déjà garanti ladite pragmatique sanction, elle ne fera point de
difficulté de renouveler à cette occasion sa garantie; et l'on doit
s'attendre que le Roi de Sardaigne n'en fera pas non plus de suivre
l'exemple de ses alliés.

Ce seroit faire tort à la pénétration des puissances engagées dans
la présente guerre si S. M. Br. et L. H. P. pensoient d'être obligées
à détailler ici les raisons qui doivent à leur avis porter lesdites
puissances à accepter ledit plan ou du moins à le regarder comme la
base sur laquelle on peut d'abord entrer en négociation touchant une
accommodement. C'est aux puissances auxquelles le susdit plan sera
présenté qu'il appartient d'en juger, sans que S. M. Br. et L. H. P.
prétendent les prévenir en sa faveur, autrement qu'en les priant d'en
combinaison les divers membres, et de comparer le tout avec l'état
présent des choses, bien persuadées que quiconque voudra se donner
cette peine n'en aura point d'avouer qu'il n'y a qu'un désir sincère
de concilier les différends, et de procurer par là une paix durable à
l'Europe. Conduit par une impartialité parfaite, qui l'ait dicté,
S. M. Br. et L. H. P. ne peuvent nullement douter qu'un tel plan

2735 ne rencontre partout un accueil favorable et que la réponse des puissances auxquelles il sera présenté de leur part ne soit aussi prompte et aussi clair et positive que la circonstance du temps le demande et qu'elle n'autorise S. M. Br. et L. H. P. ■ faire une nouvelle démarche vers une pacification générale en proposant ■ méthode la plus courte de travailler à un traité formel, dans lequel tous les différends soient aplanis et finalement ajustés. Mais quoi qu'il en arrive, S. M. Br. et L. H. P. auront du moins la consolation que ce plan servira pour le temps à venir de monument de leur désir sincère de procurer la paix à l'Europe, et que ceux qui refuseront d'y donner les mains seront seuls responsables de tous les malheurs qui pourroient arriver par la continuation de la guerre. Rien au reste n'est plus capable, de l'aveu de tout le monde, de reculer la pacification en faisant naître de nouveaux obstacles, et par conséquent rien n'est plus opposé au but de S. M. Br. et de L. H. P. en proposant ce projet d'accommodement aux parties belligérantes, que la continuation des hostilités, et c'est aussi pour ces considérations qu'elles se jugent indispensablement obligées à proposer avant toutes choses aux parties belligérantes un armistice pour tout le temps de la négociation, et de leur recommander avec tout l'empressement dont elles sont capables d'y consentir chacune de son côté, sans perte de temps, le printemps et par conséquent la saison de mettre les armées en campagne s'approchant à grand pas.

Those who had ridiculed this negotiation in embryo, and had always treated it as one that must prove abortive, triumphed extremely on its coming forth such a one as, even before it was rejected, appeared incapable of any other fate. Lord Bolingbroke was the only one not in the secret who ever pronounced so judiciously upon it as to say that Walpole was no fool, and for that reason it was impossible but that there must have been something more in this negotiation than had yet appeared. He judged right; and that something was the cession of Lorraine to France, which Holland and England told Cardinal Fleury they would readily consent to as an engraftment on their plan of pacification, but which it was impossible they could insert in the original draught; for though the Emperor, considering the connection between him and the Duke of Lorraine, might take upon him to barter the possessions

of that Prince, yet it was neither proper nor decent for 1735
the maritime powers to be cantoning out the dominions
of a sovereign who was no way concerned in the war, and
consequently had not committed his interests to their
care in making the peace.

The plan of pacification was no sooner delivered out
than rejected; and everybody said it was no wonder such
a scheme of accommodation should not take effect, when
every article of it seemed to be in favour of that power
who was not only the weakest, but had been beaten wher-
ever he had been attacked; and yet, according to this pro-
posal, would regain everything by paper that he had lost
by arms, and be in as good a situation after all his defeats
as he could have hoped to have been had they been so
many victories.

When I relate the Cardinal's having been acquainted
with every particular of this plan before it appeared, his
having consented to the insertion of every article it con-
tained, and his approbation of every step it took in its
progress towards the public appearance of it, it will be
very natural for my readers either to suspect my veracity,
or to ask how the Cardinal then came not to accept it in
his public character, to which I shall give two answers,
one of which was the reason given by his Eminence him-
self to England and Holland; the other, the secret reason
assigned by our Ministers for this extraordinary conduct
and seeming inconsistency.

The reason he gave to the maritime powers for the
rejection of this plan of pacification was that, let him be
ever so well satisfied with the scheme of this proposal
and the consequences that were tacitly understood to be
designed to flow from it (I mean the cession of Lorraine),
that he could not think of abandoning his allies and
making a separate peace, nor of forcing them to come in
to terms of general accommodation that were not as
agreeable in the parts relating to the interests of these
Princes as they were in that which concerned only his own.

1735 The real reason for his receding (or at least what was believed so by our Ministers) was this. The Cardinal's fondness of peace, and his desire to have the sole glory of making it, had induced him to undertake this negotiation quite alone, and to bind our Ministers not only in an obligation to treat with no other, but in a promise of absolute secrecy; by which means M. Chauvelin, the Garde des Sceaux in France, and coadjutor to the Cardinal in the Administration there, was entirely shut out of this transaction: and, as M. Chauvelin governed the Cardinal as absolutely as the Cardinal governed the King (with this difference only, that the King knew he was governed, whilst the Cardinal was governed without knowing it), so M. Chauvelin, partly out of pride and resentment to our Ministers, and partly in indulgence to his own inclinations, which were strongly bent on prosecuting the war, as soon as ever he was made acquainted with these proposals employed all his skill, weight, and influence, to demonstrate to the Cardinal that it was neither for the interest nor the honour of France to give in to them. And as M. Chauvelin succeeded in this, all negotiation for peace was broken off, all prospect of accommodation vanished, and the campaign was opened in Italy and on the Rhine.

After this public rejection of the plan of pacification, and before the King was yet set out for Hanover, the Court of Vienna began to press the Court of London more vehemently than ever to come into the war. Among many letters I saw tending to this end, there was one which General Deimar showed me from Prince Eugene to him, which urged this point in the least answerable manner, and the most artful of all. In this letter Prince Eugene desired General Deimar to represent to the King how long, in complaisance and deference to His Majesty, the Emperor had forebore insisting on the immediate compliance of England with the articles of those treaties by which England was bound to assist the Emperor in

the preservation of his possessions in Italy, and to put 1735
His Majesty in mind at the same time how much in the
right the Court of Vienna had been when they told him
that all the assurances France had given of desiring peace
were only to amuse and deceive him in order to prevent
England taking part in the war; to represent to His
Majesty that the Empire itself was in the utmost danger;
and at the same time to insinuate that if the maritime
powers were so careless of the interest of the Emperor in
the war, His Imperial Majesty hoped they would not be
surprised if he was as negligent of theirs in making a peace;
for, in case they would not assist him in carrying on the
war, sure nobody could blame him if he considered nothing
but himself in his manner of putting an end to it when he
was able alone to support it no longer.

By this he meant to alarm England and Holland with
the apprehensions of his intending to bias France to
restore what he had lost in Italy by the bribe of Flanders;
and, in consequence of this letter, His Imperial Majesty,
to show he was in earnest and did not care what became
of Flanders, drew out all the troops that were in garrison
there to recruit his armies in Italy and on the Rhine.

The answers from England to all these repeated
arguments and remonstrances were repeated palliatives,
evasions, and hopes of yet succeeding in our endeavours
to procure peace.

Soon after the King went to Hanover a new inducement
to enter into the war was made to glitter in His Britannic
Majesty's eyes by an offer of the command of the Imperial
army on the Rhine. This step had been foreseen by Sir
Robert before the King left England; and accordingly
His Majesty, by concerting with Sir Robert Walpole what
he should say and do in that case, was provided with an
answer.

When Count Kinski, therefore, by order of the Em-
peror, in the most obliging and most captivating manner,
made this proposal to the King at Hanover, His Majesty

1735 desired Count Kinski to assure the Emperor of the great gratitude with which he received this honour; but said he could neither think of doing anything so wrong to himself as appearing at the head of an army, as King of England, in which no Englishman was to be exposed or fight under him, and could as little persuade himself to do anything so contrary to the interest of the Emperor as take the command of the Imperial troops out of the able and experienced hands in which it was at present lodged; that, if anything could induce him to take such a step, it would be the having Prince Eugene always with him, and being sure that things, though His Majesty had the nominal command, would be then done as much in pursuance of that great man's advice as before they had been in obedience to his order; but that, if he had been hitherto suspected of not doing everything in his power for the service of His Imperial Majesty, and had made himself liable to the reproach of faults of omission, it would be the highest imprudence in him to incur further reproach for faults of commission, which must be his situation if any sinister accident should happen, and he should make himself responsible for the chance of war; nor could he hope to avoid that additional demerit, however unjustly it might be imputed to him, since he had already felt the weight of being upbraided (in a manner he had as little deserved) for the hitherto ill success of his good offices towards procuring a peace.

In this manner was the King saved from the inconveniences into which he would have drawn himself and this country had the songs of these military sirens (the songs he was always most ready to listen to) prevailed on His Majesty to follow their invitation; but Sir Robert Walpole had, before he set out, tied him so fast to the mast that he enjoyed the safety of Ulysses, though he did not, like him, owe that safety to his own prudence and foresight.

When new proposals were made to the Allies for a

cessation of arms, they offered to agree to an armistice, 1735 provided things should remain just in the condition they now were, and every article of accommodation be referred to a Congress.

The policy of the Allies in this demand was, that all the Emperor's possessions in Italy might be cantoned out, and remain in the hands of the two Princes that had conquered them; that Mantua, the only place the Emperor yet retained in Italy, might not be reduced, because they did not know what to do with it if it were, the Kings of Spain and Sardinia not being able to agree about it; that the Diet of Poland, which was just going to meet, might not confirm by civil power to King Augustus what military power had acquired for him; and that the Elector of Bavaria, by the march of forty thousand Russians through his territories, might neither be obliged to abandon the interests of France nor be punished for having hitherto adhered to them.

This proposal, therefore, as the single preliminary to an armistice, of leaving things just as they were, and referring all disputes to a Congress, was rejected by the Emperor and the maritime powers; whilst the summer was protracted without anything material being done either in the cabinet or the field, the armies on the Rhine doing nothing but looking at one another, and the great acquisition of the unopposed armies of the Allies in Italy amounting to nothing more than the taking of Mirandola, which, although the work of the whole summer, ought naturally to have been nothing more than the employment of a week.

Whatever step Sir Robert Walpole took in England with regard to all these negotiations, though concerted solely, and concluded absolutely, in reality by the Queen and him in her closet, wore the face of being always as much the act of the whole Cabinet Council as theirs, not a letter coming from Hanover relating to these things that was not communicated to the Cabinet Council, nor any

1735 piece of advice sent thither but what was signed by them. So that Sir Robert Walpole, with a dexterity equal to his power, whilst in fact he did everything alone, was responsible for nothing but in common, whilst those ciphers of the Cabinet signed everything he dictated, and, without the least share of honour or power, bound themselves equally with him in case this political merchant should be bankrupt.

On the other side of the water, the sagacious Lord Harrington, who was not such a mole, dull as he was, not to know in what manner things were transacted here, set up for an interest of his own with the King, and of course pretended to have an opinion of his own in what was doing. Accordingly he was perpetually sending over despatches hither, in which he took the liberty, under the pretence of differing only with the Cabinet Council, to arraign all the acts and cavil at all the measures of the Queen.

It was thought to be by his advice, too, that the King, in several things, did acts as King at Hanover, particularly those of signing commissions for officers, which in law, to be sure, were not valid acts, the regal power not being divisible, and the instrument that constituted the Queen Regent having of course delegated all the regal power to, and vested it in, her.

Sir Robert Walpole, as well as the Lord Chancellor and Lord Hardwicke, soon hit this blot; they saw the absurdity of the proceeding, and represented it to the Queen, but she absolutely forbade them speaking of it, or endeavouring to touch this point by mentioning it to the King; knowing full well, from the temper of His Majesty, let her be ever so manifestly and indubitably in the right, the danger there would be in starting the least controversion of any power he had a mind to claim or exercise; and how much the dispute lying between him and her, though merely in a point of form, would make the path more slippery, and render the step more delicate.

Whilst the King was at Hanover there happened a 1735 marriage in England which I believe surprised His Majesty as much as it did many of his subjects; I mean Lady Suffolk's with Mr. George Berkeley, an old lover of Mrs. Pulteney's, formerly mentioned in these papers. Mr. Berkeley was neither young, handsome, healthy, nor rich, which made people wonder what induced Lady Suffolk's prudence to deviate into this unaccountable piece of folly. Some imagined it was to persuade the world that nothing criminal had ever passed between her and the King; others that it was to pique the King. If this was her reason, she succeeded very ■ in her design, for the King, in answer to that letter from the Queen that gave him the first account of the marriage, told her: "*J'étois extrêmement surpris de la disposition que vous m'avez mandé que ma vieille maîtresse a fait de son corps en mariage à ce vieux goutteux George Berkeley,¹ et je m'en rejouis fort. Je ne voudrois pas faire de tels présens à mes amis; et quand mes ennemis me volent, plut à Dieu que ce soit toujours de cette façon.*"

Those who had a mind to abuse Lady Suffolk the most upon this occasion said she had been so long used to a companion that she could not live without something in that style, and that at her time of life, as there was none to be lost, so she took up with the first engagement that offered. The Queen, who was the first body that told me this marriage was certainly over, and would in a very short time be publicly owned, was extremely peevish with me for saying I did not believe one word of the matter, and that I was sure it was somebody who proposed making their court, by putting Lady Suffolk in this simple light, who had told her this improbable story. "*Mon Dieu,*" said the Queen, "*what an opiniâtre devil you are, that you will never believe what one tells you one knows to be true, because you happen not to think it probable! Perhaps,*" continued she, "*you are one of those who have so high an*

¹Lady Suffolk was 54 and Mr. Berkeley 42.

1735 opinion of her understanding, that you think it impossible she should do a silly thing; for my part, I have always heard a great deal of her great sense from other people, but I never saw her, in any material great occurrence of her life, take a sensible step since I knew her; her going from Court was the silliest thing she could do at that time, and this match the silliest thing she could do now; all her behaviour to the King whilst she was at Court was as ill-judged as her behaviour to me at leaving it."

Upon the Queen's mentioning Lady Suffolk's behaviour to her upon her leaving the Court, I said that was a thing that had excited my curiosity more than any incident that had ever happened since my being in it; for that I could not possibly imagine that Lady Suffolk could come to Her Majesty and say: "Madam, your husband being weary of me, I cannot possibly stay in your house or your service any longer"; and yet, if she did not say that, I could not comprehend what it was she did say. The Queen told me Lady Suffolk had not spoken her sense in those words, but that they differed little in their purport from what I imagined was impossible for her to suggest. "Then, pray, Madam," said I, "may I beg to know what was Your Majesty's answer?" "I told her," said the Queen, "that she and I were not of an age to think of these sort of things in such a romantic way, and said: 'My good Lady Suffolk, you are the best servant in the world, and, as I should be most extremely sorry to lose you, pray take a week to consider of this business, and give me your word not to read any romances in that time, and then I dare say you will lay aside all thought of doing what, believe me, you will repent, and what I am very sure I shall be very sorry for.'"

The Queen in this conversation told me many other circumstances relating to Lady Suffolk's affairs, and to her conduct at Court, that till then I was entirely unacquainted with, particularly that she had had £2000 a year constantly from the King whilst he was Prince, and £3200

ever since he was King, besides several little dabs of money 1735
both before and since he came to the Crown.

She told me the whole history of the bustle Mr. Howard had made to take his wife from Court which I have in gross related before in these papers; and that, when Mr. Howard came to Her Majesty, and said he would take his wife out of Her Majesty's coach if he met her in it, she had bid him "do it if he dare"; "though," said she, "I was horribly afraid of him (for we were tête-à-tête) all the while I was thus playing the bully. What added to my fear upon this occasion," said the Queen, "was that, as I knew him to be so brutal, as well as a little mad, and seldom quite sober, so I did not think it impossible but that he might throw me out of that window (for it was in this very room our interview was, and that sash then open just as it is now); but as soon as I had got near the door, and thought myself safe from being thrown out of the window, je pris mon grand ton de Reine, et je disois I would be glad to see who should dare to open my coach-door and take out one of my servants; sachant tout le temps qu'il le pouvoit faire s'il le vouloit, et qu'il auroit sa femme, et moi l'affront. Then I told him that my resolution was positively neither to force his wife to go to him if she had no mind to it, nor to keep her if she had. He then said he would complain to the King; upon which je prenois encore mon haut ton, and said the King had nothing to do with my servants, and for that reason he might save himself that trouble, as I was sure the King would give him no answer but that it was none of his business to concern himself with my family; and after a good deal more conversation of this kind (I standing close to the door all the while to give me courage), Monsieur Howard et moi nous nous donnions le bonjour, et il se retira.

"After this, that old fool my Lord Trevor came to me from Mrs. Howard, and, after thanking me in her name for what I had done, proposed to me to give £1,200 a year

1735 to Mr. Howard to let his wife stay with me; but as I thought I had done full enough, and that it was a little too much not only to keep the King's guenipes" (in English trulls) "under my roof, but to pay them too, I pleaded poverty to my good Lord Trevor, and said I would do anything to keep so good a servant as Mrs. Howard about me, but that for the £1,200 a year, I really could not afford it.

"But, after all this matter was settled, the first thing this wise, prudent Lady Suffolk did was to pick a quarrel with me about holding a basin in the ceremony of my dressing, and to tell me, with her little fierce eyes, and cheeks as red as your coat, that positively she would not do it; to which I made her no answer then in anger, but calmly, as I would have said to a naughty child: 'Yes, my dear Howard, I am sure you will; indeed you will. Go, go! fie for shame! Go, my good Howard; we will talk of this another time.'

"About a week after, when upon maturer deliberation she had done everything about the basin that I would have her, I told her I knew we should be good friends again; but could not help adding, in a little more serious voice, that I owned of all my servants I had least expected, as I had least deserved it, such treatment from her, when she knew I had held her up at a time when it was in my power, if I had pleased, any hour of the day, to let her drop through my fingers—thus——."

So much for Lady Suffolk. To return therefore to Germany. During the King's residence there, it was contrived that he should see, as by accident, the Princess of Saxe-Gotha at Herrenhausen. The consequence of this interview was his fixing upon Her Highness for the future bride of the Prince of Wales, and the treaty was immediately set on foot.

Soon after he came to this resolution he wrote to the Queen to give her leave to communicate it to her son; and upon her doing so she told him that it would certainly be

proper for him to take leave of a mistress whom he kept in 1735 so open a manner as he did Miss Vane.

The Prince's attachment to Lady Archibald Hamilton growing every day stronger than the other, made him listen to this advice from the Queen with more willingness than compliance with her counsel, or decency in his own conduct, without this additional motive, would in all probability have produced.

Lady Archibald Hamilton was not young, had never been very pretty, and had lost at least as much of that small share of beauty she once possessed as it is usual for women to do at five-and-thirty, and after having lain many years by a man old enough to be her father and being the mother of ten children.

Her husband, Lord Archibald Hamilton, was a Scotchman, uncle to the Duke of Hamilton, a Lord of the Admiralty, and of so quiet, so secure, and contented a temper, that he seemed cut out to play the passive character his wife and the Prince had graciously allotted him.

His wife was cunning, and had just sense enough to make that cunning useful to her, when employed to work on such a husband as Lord Archibald Hamilton, and such a lover as the Prince of Wales; and succeeded perfectly well in flattering the first into an opinion of her virtue, and the latter into an admiration of her beauty and understanding, which she facilitated by the much easier task of making the Prince believe she was entirely captivated by his.

But as there always are some people who doubt of the most notorious intrigues, as well as others who make no doubt of what only themselves believe, so there were some few who thought, or, I rather believe, affected to think, that this commerce between Lady Archibald Hamilton and the Prince was merely platonic, though stronger symptoms of an *affaire faite* never appeared on any pair than were to be seen between this couple. He saw her often at her own house, where he seemed as welcome to the master as the

1735 mistress; he met her often, too, at her sister's; walked with her day after day for hours together tête-à-tête in a morning in St. James's Park; and whenever she was at the drawing-room (which was pretty frequently), his behaviour was so remarkable that his nose and her ear were inseparable, whilst, without discontinuing, he would talk to her as if he had rather been relating than conversing from the time he came into the room to the moment he left it, and then seemed to be rather interrupted than to have finished.

Her jealousy of Miss Vane made her not satisfied with the Prince's only taking a public leave of her; she feared, notwithstanding that step was taken to amuse the world, and as a necessary preliminary to his future marriage, that His Royal Highness would still continue to see her in private, and perhaps with more pleasure when it would be with less liberty.

The Prince, therefore, to please Lady Archibald Hamilton and quiet these apprehensions, not only sent Lord Baltimore, one of his Lords of the Bedchamber, to Miss Vane to say how necessary it was, on his marriage being now so near concluded, for him to take his leave of her, but ordered Lord Baltimore to propose to her, as the most proper manner of parting both for him and her, that she should go immediately for two or three years into Holland or France, or any other place she would choose out of England. And in case Miss Vane did not seem to relish this proposal, Lord Baltimore was ordered to add, that though the Prince would for her life continue the £1,600 a year he had allowed her ever since she left the Court in case she complied with this proposal, that he would not allow her one farthing if she rejected it. As for her son, Lord Baltimore was to tell her that the Prince would take care of his education here in England; and his Lordship was fully instructed not only to press the journey on Miss Vane in point of interest, but to represent to her how much more agreeable it would certainly be for her to go out of

the way for some time, and avoid seeing and hearing all the little malicious triumphs of those who would not fail to repay themselves on this occasion for all that their envy had made them suffer on her account during her prosperity and her possession of the Prince's favour. 1735

When Lord Baltimore brought this proposal to Miss Vane, she was extremely shocked not only at the purport of his message but this manner of delivering it. For though Mr. Lyttelton had attached himself to Lady Archibald Hamilton, and Dodington she knew had a mind to attach the Prince to a mistress of his own providing, one Miss Bowyer, an intimate friend to his own mistress Miss Bean, yet Miss Vane had always, and with great reason, looked on Lord Baltimore, who during her favour had made great court to her, as entirely attached to her interest. Her answer therefore to Lord Baltimore was that she would send none to the Prince through a hand from which she found she was to expect so little friendship, and by a man whom she perceived too late she had very injudiciously hitherto taken for her well-wisher.

Lord Hervey and Miss Vane met constantly all this summer once or twice a week. The Prince had taken her a house at Wimbledon where all her servants were, except one old fellow and a maid, who were left in her house in town. This made it easy for her to let Lord Hervey into her house in town unperceived and thither once or twice a week she constantly came to meet him, who used to be admitted as soon as it was dark and go away before it was light.

But the difficulty of getting tea, fruit, and supper, at her house made them soon change the scene of their meeting to his lodgings at St. James's, and his wife being gone into France with the Duke and Duchess of Richmond for three months, this coast was quite clear. Miss Vane used to walk thither, Lord Hervey himself letting her in and out; and in this manner they used to pass whole nights together, as little apprehensive of danger as if no

1735 eyes had been upon them and that at this juncture it would not have been as convenient to the Prince as destructive to her to have traced this commerce and proved it upon her.

Miss Vane, who had for several years been subject to fits, was at this time extremely ill, and one night when she was in bed at St. James's was taken suddenly with so violent a fit of the cholic that in a quarter of an hour she fell into convulsions. Lord Hervey in vain to recover her crammed cordials and gold powder down her throat; her convulsions grew stronger and at last she fell into a swoon that lasted so long he thought her absolutely dead.

What confusion and distress this put his Lordship into is easier to be imagined than described. He did not dare to send for any assistance, nor even to call a servant into the room, for not one was trusted with the secret. What to do he could not tell, nor what would or would not be said when it should come out, and to conceal it was impossible, that Miss Vane was found dead in his lodgings. Whilst he was agitated with these thoughts and apprehensions she came to herself, and by the help of more cordials, more gold powder, and hot napkins to her stomach, he got her up, dressed her, and led her to a chair in Pall-Mall, not daring to have one brought to take her up at his lodgings.

But even this accident did not prevent these indiscreet people from exposing themselves in the same manner to the same dangers, or from meeting as frequently as they had formerly done.

As soon as Miss Vane had received this message by Lord Baltimore, she wrote to Lord Hervey to tell him that she must speak to him the next day, though it was not their usual day for meeting, on business of the utmost consequence, in which she stood in need of his immediate advice. Curiosity as well as compliance made him obey this summons, and as soon as they met she related all the particulars of what had passed between her and Lord

Baltimore, abusing him much, the Prince more, and telling 1735
Lord Hervey that as she wished nothing so much as to be
disembarrassed of the Prince, except the being at liberty
to see his Lordship with more ease, so this proposal of
separation from H.R.H. would have given her much more
pleasure than ever she found in his acquaintance had it
not been for this conditional article of going out of Eng-
land, which she was determined for his Lordship's sake
not to comply with, though she was entirely at a loss how
she should go about to avoid it. She said she had no friend
left about the Prince, now she had found out Lord Balti-
more to be no longer such, who had common sense, and
was resolved therefore to send her answer to the Prince
in writing. What that answer must be, she said, she de-
pended entirely on Lord Hervey to determine, and begged
him therefore to write her a copy of such a letter as he
thought it proper on this occasion she should send.

Lord Hervey, who had a mind to keep Miss Vane in
England, and was not a little pleased to have an oppor-
tunity of fretting the Prince, undertook this commission
very willingly, and wrote immediately the following copy
of the letter she was to send.

SIR,

Considering the manner in which I have lived with Your
Royal Highness, I think I might, without being thought very im-
pertinent, begin this letter with complaining that, when you have
anything to say to me, Your Royal Highness should think an
ambassador necessary to go between us; and though a harsh or
unkind thing, I must own, would always be little consistent with
what I think I have deserved from Your Royal Highness, yet it
would sure want no such additional weight as the letting another
convey it, and consequently be acquainted with the little regard or
concern you retain for me.

That Your Royal Highness is going to be married I may repine
at; but I appeal to you if ever I was so unreasonable as to reproach
you with it, or to imagine that my interest was to be put in com-
petition with the interest of England, or that what was right for
your affairs was not to outweigh every consideration of mine.

1735 But that Your Royal Highness should break with me in the most shocking way; that you should not be content to abandon me without banishing me, nor take yourself from me without driving me from every other friend, relation, and acquaintance, and depriving me of those comforts at a time when I shall want them most; is sure an aggravation to my bad fortune and unhappy situation which you are as much in the wrong to ask me as I should be myself to comply with.

Your Royal Highness need not be put in mind who I am, nor from whence you took me. That I acted not like what I was born, others may reproach me; but if you took me from happiness and brought me to misery, that I might reproach you. That I have long lost your heart I have long seen and long mourned. To gain it, or rather to reward the gift you made me of it, I sacrificed my time, my youth, my character, the world, my family, and everything that a woman can sacrifice to a man she loves. How little I considered my interest, you must know by my never naming my interest to you when I made this sacrifice, and by my trusting to your honour when I showed so little regard, when put in balance with my love, to my own. I have resigned everything for your sake but my life; and, had you loved me still, I would have risked even that too to please you; but as it is, I cannot think in my state of health of going out of England, far from all friends and all physicians I can trust, and of whom I stand in so much need. My child is the only consolation I have left. I cannot leave him, nor shall anything but death ever make me quit the country he is in. Your Royal Highness may do with me what you please; but a Prince who is one day to rule this country will sure, for his own sake, never show he will make use of power to distress undeservedly; and that one who has put herself without conditions into his hands has the hardest terms imposed upon her, though she never in her life did one action that deserved anything but your favour, your compassion, and your friendship; and it is for these reasons I doubt not but Your Royal Highness will on this occasion, for your own sake if not for mine, do everything that will hinder you from being blamed and me from being more miserable than the reflection of what is past must necessarily make one who has known what it was to be happy, and can never expect ■ taste that font again.

I know how vain it would be to think reproaches could ever regain a heart which kindness could not keep, and for that reason I will add nothing more than to assure Your Royal Highness I shall ever wish you health, prosperity, and happiness, and shall ever be, with unalterable affection, etc.

Miss Vane was extremely pleased with every part of this letter except that which professed any regard for His Royal Highness, and would fain have had those expressions more of a piece with the rest. She would also have carried this letter away with her to have copied it at home, but Lord Hervey insisted on its not going out of his lodgings in his handwriting, and, notwithstanding all the opposition she made to it, and her reproaches to him for his distrusting her conduct on an occasion where she was as much or more concerned than he to keep the secret, he made her write it out in her own hand before he let her stir out of the lodgings. 1735

And that her brother Harry Vane might not disavow her in this proceeding, Lord Hervey advised her, before she sent the letter to the Prince, to send a copy of it to her brother for his approbation. Harry Vane, knowing by the style of the letter that it was none of her own, and guessing it (as she told Lord Hervey) to be Mr. Pulteney's, readily gave in to her sending what he thought had been advised by one whose understanding and friendship for his sister he had so great an opinion of.

Accordingly the letter was sent through one Vreid's hands, a *valet de chambre* of His Royal Highness who used always to convey all the letters that passed between them. As soon as the Prince received it he flew into a violent passion, said he knew the letter was not of her writing, and that he would be revenged not only of the villain who had given her this advice, but of her for following it. The letter was shown by him to his mother, his sisters, his servants, and everybody that he could get to read it, in order to justify the rigour with which he said he was determined to treat her if she did not produce the rascal that had put her upon taking this step. On the other hand, Miss Vane showed the letter to all her friends, and told the story of Lord Baltimore's embassy that occasioned it; and Lord Hervey had the secret satisfaction of exposing and fretting the Prince; whilst everybody who pretended

1735 the least regard for Miss Vane, or for Mr. Pulteney, who was generally thought the author, justified that which they would have been the first people to condemn, had they known out of what quiver this arrow had been shot.

Miss Vane stuck to it that she had written every word of the letter herself, and justified the substance of it on the provocation of Lord Baltimore's having told her from the Prince that, if she would not live abroad, she might for him starve in England.

The Prince, finding everybody condemned the brutality of this rough message, determined to deny he had ever sent it; and Lord Baltimore not being much fonder of the credit of delivering it, the Prince and he agreed together to say the proposal was made to her as a thing His Royal Highness thought would be agreeable to her, from what Miss Janssen, sister to Lord Baltimore's wife (a very dexterous lady), had reported from a conference she had had with Miss Vane on this subject, in which she had been commissioned to feel Miss Vane's pulse on this point, and, if she could, to lead her to it.

As the Prince therefore denied the having sent, and Lord Baltimore the having delivered, the rough message Miss Vane said she had received, and that she could make no proof of it, as she had been alone with Lord Baltimore when this interview happened, her brother, Mr. Pulteney, Mr. Mansel, and all those who pretended any remains of friendship for her, advised her to write a second letter to the Prince, in which she should only justify the former on the supposition of her having understood Lord Baltimore in the manner I have already related.

She had recourse for the second letter to the same hand that worked the first, and these were the contents of it:

It is so easy to remove the appearance of a fault when one is conscious of not meaning to commit one, that I make no doubt but Your Royal Highness will think me thoroughly justified for writing my last letter when I tell you nothing could have induced me to

such an expostulation but the harsh message which I thought I had received by Your Royal Highness's order through Lord Baltimore. 1735

In that confusion, shame, and vexation, I wrote just what I felt, but resolved (how ill I might execute my resolution I know not) to urge my own request, and to represent what I thought your ill usage of me, in the most respectful terms that such complaints would admit of. If I said anything I ought not to say, or in a manner I ought not to say it, I am heartily sorry, and ask your pardon, and appeal now to your justice to tell me whether I ever did or said anything in my life that was not consistent with what I owed to you, though I am very ready to own I have for your sake done things very inconsistent with what I owed to myself.

That I received such a message by Lord Baltimore is certain; whether he was authorised to deliver it I know not; it is certain, too, that all the messages I ever sent by him were answers to others, and not any that came originally from me. It is hard Your Royal Highness will not allow me an opportunity to clear myself; but, deal with me as you please, I shall ever pray for your happiness and prosperity, even whilst I reflect it is at least to your love, if not to your hate, that I owe the loss of my own. I am, with the greatest respect and truth, etc.

In consequence of all these transactions, it was at last settled that she should have her house in Grosvenor Street for ever, £1,600 a year for life, that her son should not be taken from her, and that she should be at her liberty to live where she pleased.

But soon after this, her cholics, loss of appetite, and general decay, growing fast upon her, she was advised to go to Bath, where, in about two months, she finished a life that, at her going to Bath, she said was, from the circumstances she was now in, likely to prove the happiest she had ever had.

Her son, who was left with her brother when she went to Bath, died about a week before her of convulsion fits. The Queen and the Princess Caroline told Lord Hervey they thought the Prince more afflicted for the loss of this child than they had ever seen him on any occasion, or thought him capable of being.

1735 But to go back to the King. The time being now come that His Majesty was obliged to undergo the mortification of returning to his British dominions, in order to keep his birthday there, he at last sent the long-expected orders for the yachts; and hearing they were at Helvoetsluys, he set out from Hanover on Wednesday morning, the 22nd of October, and arrived at Kensington the Sunday following, before dinner, just as the Queen returned from chapel. Her Majesty, attended by all the Court, met him at the great gate as he alighted from his coach. She kissed his hand before she presumed to touch his lips, mutual embraces followed, and this kissing ceremony at the door of the coach ended as it began, by Her Majesty again gluing her mouth to the King's hand, which he was graciously pleased to offer afterwards to lead her upstairs. This was a sort of triennial honour bestowed upon the Queen by His Majesty, for I never knew him to confer it on any other occasion than a return from Hanover. As soon as they were got upstairs they went directly into the Queen's gallery, where the King ordered all the company, both men and women, to be let in and presented to him.

He stayed there near half an hour, talked to most people but the Queen, and it was by her order, not his, that the company was at last dismissed.

But by unreasonably hurrying himself to arrive in England, though he was as unreasonably sorry to return thither at all, he had made himself extremely ill; for whilst he travelled in this violent manner, day and night, and almost without any rest, only for the pleasure of bragging how quick he moved, he had so heated his blood that he was feverish for several days after he returned; and by sitting so long in his coach had brought upon himself such a severe fit of the piles, to which he was extremely subject, that he was in great pain, lost a great quantity of blood, and had so violent an inflammation and swelling attending this complaint, that for a fortnight together his surgeon

was forced to attend him with alternate applications of 1735
lancets and fomentations.

This disorder was kept a great secret to all the Court, but the consequences of it were no secret. Everybody shared the warm and frequent sallies of his abominable temper, and everybody imputed them to what was the joint though not the sole cause of these eruptions, which was the affliction he felt for the change of a German life to an English one, with the society of a stale wife instead of a new mistress; and, what grated more than all the rest, the transition to limited from unlimited power.

Whilst the late King lived, everybody imagined this Prince loved England and hated Germany; but from the time of his first journey, after he was King, to Hanover, people began to find, if they had not been deceived in their former opinion, at least they would be so in their expectations; and that his thoughts, whatever they might have been, were no longer turned either with contempt or dislike to his Electoral dominions. But after this last journey Hanover had so completed the conquest of his affections that there was nothing English ever commended in his presence that he did not always show, or pretend to show, was surpassed by something of the same kind in Germany. No English or even French cook could dress a dinner; no English confectioner set out a dessert; no English player could act; no English coachman could drive, or English jockey ride, nor were any English horses fit to be drove or fit to be ridden; no Englishman knew how to come into a room, nor any Englishwoman how to dress herself, nor were there any diversions in England, public or private, nor any man or woman in England whose conversation was to be borne—the one, as he said, talking of nothing but their dull politics, and the others of nothing but their ugly clothes. Whereas at Hanover all these things were in the utmost perfection. The men were patterns of politeness, bravery, and gallantry; the women of beauty, wit, and entertainment; his

1735 troops there were the bravest in the world, his counsellors the wisest, his manufacturers the most ingenious, his subjects the happiest; and at Hanover, in short, plenty reigned, magnificence resided, arts flourished, diversions abounded, riches flowed, and everything was in the utmost perfection that contributes to make a prince great or a people blessed.

Forced from that magnificent delightful dwelling to return again to this mean dull island, it was no wonder, since these were his notions of them, that he felt as great a change in his humour as in his enjoyments; and that frowns should take the place of smiles upon his countenance, when regret had taken that of pleasure in his heart. But as everybody who came near him, in any calling (except just that of a common courtier in his public circle at the levee or the drawing-room), had some share of his bilious temper at this time, so what everybody knew and everybody felt, everybody talked of and everybody confessed; for, by a practice very uncommon in courts, people, instead of hiding with shame the snubs they received from their master, bragged of them in mirth; and, by finding these distinctions so general, revealed in sport those affronts which, had they been more particular, the objects of them would have concealed in sorrow.

In truth he hated the English, looked upon them all as king-killers and republicans, grudged them their riches as well as their liberty, thought them all overpaid, and said to Lady Sundon one day as she was waiting at dinner, just after he returned from Germany, that he was forced to distribute his favours here very differently from the manner in which he bestowed them at Hanover; that there he rewarded people for doing their duty and serving him well, but that here he was obliged to enrich people for being rascals, and buy them not to cut his throat.

The Queen did not always think in a different style of the English, though she kept her thoughts more to herself than the King, as being more prudent, more sensible,

and more mistress of her passions; yet even she could not 1735
entirely disguise these sentiments to the observation of those who were perpetually about her, and put her upon subjects that betrayed her into revealing them.

I have heard her at different times speak with great indignation against assertors of the people's rights; have heard her call the King, not without some despute, the humble servant of the Parliament, the pensioner of his people and a puppet of sovereignty, that was forced to go to them for every shilling he wanted, that was obliged to court those who were always abusing him, and could do nothing of himself. And once added, that a good deal of that liberty that made them so insolent, if she could do it, should be much abridged; nor was it possible for the best prince in the world to be very solicitous to procure benefits for subjects that never cared to trust him. At other times she was more upon her guard: I have heard her say she wondered how the English could imagine that any sensible prince would take away their liberty if he could. "My God!" she cried, "what a figure would this poor island make in Europe if it were not for its government! It is its excellent free government that makes all its inhabitants industrious, as they know that what they get nobody can take from them; it is its free government, too, that makes foreigners send their money hither, because they know it is secure, and that the prince cannot touch it; and since it is its freedom to which this kingdom owes everything that makes it great, what prince, who had his senses, and knew that his own greatness depended on the greatness of the country over which he reigned, would wish to take away what made both him and them considerable? I had as lief," added she, "be Elector of Hanover as King of England, if the government was the same. Who the devil would take you all, or think you worth having, that had anything else, if you had not your liberties? Your island might be a very pretty thing in that case for Bridgeman and Kent to cut out into gardens;

1735 but, for the figure it would make in Europe, it would be of no more consequence here in the West than Madagascar is in the East: and for this reason, your princes, if they are sensible, as impudent and as insolent as you all are with your troublesome liberty, will rather bear with your impertinences than cure them, a way that would lessen their influence in Europe full as much as it would increase their power at home."

But, at the very moment Her Majesty was uttering these truths, the love of rule, the thirst of dominion, and the jealousy of prerogative were so strongly implanted in her, the German and the Queen so rooted in her mind, that the King himself had not more at heart all the trappings and pageantry of sovereignty than she the essential parts of it; nor could she more easily brook any checks to the authority of the Crown than he any contradiction to his opinion.

His Majesty stayed but two days after his arrival at Kensington, and then removed to London, to keep his birthday and settle there for the winter; but during this short stay at Kensington most of the inhabitants of the Court spoke of his behaviour to the Queen as quite different from what it had formerly been, some of them from seeing instances of the change, and others from fancying they saw them because they expected to see them.

The accumulated trifles that contribute to forming opinions of this kind are much easier observed than related, and depend upon the combination of so many little circumstances that to try to describe them would be a task as tedious as imperfect. One example, however, I will give. In the absence of the King, the Queen had taken several very bad pictures out of the great drawing-room at Kensington, and put very good ones in their places. The King, affecting, for the sake of contradiction, to dislike this change, or, from his extreme ignorance in painting, really disapproving it, told Lord Hervey, as Vice-Chamberlain, that he would have every new picture

taken away, and every old one replaced. Lord Hervey, 1735 who had a mind to make his court to the Queen by opposing this order, asked if His Majesty would not give leave for the two Vandykes, at least, on each side of the chimney to remain, instead of those two sign-posts, done by nobody knew who, that had been removed to make way for them. To which the King answered, "My Lord, I have a great respect for your taste in what you understand, but in pictures I beg leave to follow my own. I suppose you assisted the Queen with your fine advice when she was pulling my house to pieces and spoiling all my furniture. Thank God, at least she has left the walls standing! As for the Vandykes, I do not care whether they are changed or no; but for the picture with the dirty frame over the door, and the three nasty little children,¹ I will have them taken away, and the old ones restored; I will have it done too to-morrow morning before I go to London, or else I know it will not be done at all." "Would Your Majesty," said Lord Hervey, "have the gigantic fat Venus restored too?" "Yes, my lord; I am not so nice as your Lordship. I like my fat Venus much better than anything you have given me instead of her." Lord Hervey thought, though he did not dare to say, that, if His Majesty had liked his fat Venus as well as he used to do, there would have been none of these disputations. However, finding his jokes on this occasion were as little tasted as his reasonings approved, and that the King, as usual, grew more warm and more peremptory on everything that was said to cool and alter him, his Lordship was forced to make a serious bow; and though he knew the fat Venus was at Windsor, some of the other pictures at Hampton Court, and all the frames of the removed pictures cut or enlarged to fit their successors, he assured His Majesty that everything should be done without fail, next morning, just as he had ordered.

¹No doubt the Vandyke of Charles I.'s children, now at Windsor Castle.

1735 Lord Hervey told the Queen, next morning at breakfast, what had passed the night before, who affected to laugh, but was a good deal displeased, and more ashamed. She said the King, to be sure, was master of his own furniture; and asked Lord Hervey if the pictures were changed; who told her "No," and why it was impossible they should. She charged him not to tell the King why, but to find out some other reason. Whilst they were speaking the King came in, but, by good luck, said not one word of the pictures. His Majesty stayed about five minutes in the gallery; snubbed the Queen, who was drinking chocolate, for being always stuffing, the Princess Emily for not hearing him, the Princess Caroline for being grown fat, the Duke for standing awkwardly, Lord Hervey for not knowing what relation the Prince of Sultzbach was to the Elector Palatine, and then carried the Queen to walk, and be resnubbed, in the garden. The pictures were altered according to the King's direction soon after; and the excuse Lord Hervey made for their not being done that morning was the man's being out of the way who was always employed on those occasions.

When Lord Hervey told Sir Robert Walpole how ill it went with the Queen, Sir Robert said it was impossible, since the King had tasted better things, it should be otherwise; and that he had told the Queen she must not expect after thirty years' acquaintance, to have the same influence that she had formerly; that three-and-fifty and three-and-twenty could no more resemble one another in their effects than in their looks; and that, if he might advise, she should no longer depend upon her person, but her head, for her influence, as the one would now be of little use to her, and the other could never fail her. He added another piece of advice to this, which I believe was as little tasted as that which introduced it. It was to send for Lady Tankerville, a handsome, good-natured, simple woman (to whom the King had formerly been coquet), out of the country, and place her every evening at commerce or quadrille in the

King's way. He told the Queen it was impossible the 1735
King should long bear to pass his evenings with his own
daughters after having tasted the sweets of passing them
with other people's, and that, if the King would have
somebody else, it would be better to have that somebody
chosen by her than by him; that Lady Tankerville was a
very safe fool, and would give the King some amusement
without giving Her Majesty any trouble. Lady Deloraine,
who was very handsome, and the only woman that ever
played with him in his daughters' apartment, Sir Robert
said was a very dangerous one; a weak head, a pretty face,
a lying tongue, and a false heart, making always sad work
with the smallest degree of power or interest to help them
forward; and that some degree of power or interest must
always follow frequent opportunities given to a very
coquette pretty woman with a very coquet idle man,
especially without a rival to disturb or share with her. I must
observe here, by the by, that Sir Robert Walpole told Lord
Hervey, whilst he was relating this conference, that the
King had bragged he had last winter lain with Lady Delor-
aine, which I must also observe I do not believe, I mean
that the King had lain with her and not that he would not
have told it if he had, nor that the scruple of making one
daughter's governess his whore and the other daughter's
apartment his bawdy house prevented him; yet that must
have been the case had he lain with Lady Deloraine, for
he never saw her anywhere else.

Lord Hervey asked Sir Robert Walpole how the Queen
behaved upon his giving her this counsel, and was an-
swered, that she laughed, took it extremely well, and
seemed mightily pleased with all he said; which I dare
say was not the case. That the Queen laughed, I can
easily believe; but imagine the laugh was rather a sign of
her having a mind to disguise her not being pleased, than any
mark that she was so; and I have the more reason to believe
so, as I have been an eye-witness to the manner in which
she has received ill-understood jokes of that kind from the

1735 same hand, particularly one this year at the King's birthday, when, pointing to some jewels in her hair, she said, "I think I am extremely fine too, though" (alluding to the manner of putting them on) "un peu à la Moïse; I think they have given me horns." Upon which Sir Robert Walpole burst out into a laugh, and said he believed Mrs. Purcel (the woman who usually dressed the Queen's head) was a wag. The Queen laughed on this occasion too; but, if I know anything of her countenance, without being pleased, and not without blushing.

This style of joking was every way so ill understood in Sir Robert Walpole, that it was astonishing one of his extreme penetration could be guilty of it once, but it was much more surprising that with all his observation he could be guilty of it twice.

For in the first place, when he told the Queen that the hold she used to have of the King by the charms of her person was quite lost, it was not true; it was weakened but not broken, and the charms of a younger person pulled him strongly perhaps another way, but they had not dissolved her influence, though they balanced it. In the next place, had it been true that the Queen's person could no longer charm any man, I have a notion that would be a piece of intelligence which no woman would love or like any man the better for giving her. It is a sort of thing which every woman is so reluctant to believe, that she may feel the effects of it long without being convinced that those effects can proceed from no other cause; and even after she is convinced of it herself, she still hopes other people have not found it out, and cannot help disliking anybody who lets her know he sees what she wishes everybody should be blind to.

In the midst of all this ill-humour shown by the King to the Queen at his first arrival, he made her a present of some fine coach-horses he brought from Hanover, which those who knew not his manner of thinking, and his usual motives for making presents of this sort to the Queen,

took to be a mark of his kindness; but the truth was, he brought the horses over because he had a vanity in showing them here, and gave them to the Queen as he had done Richmond, and several sets of horses before, which he used as much as she, that Her Majesty, having the nominal property of them, might be at the expense of keeping them. 1735

When he came to London his humour was not much mended by the circumstances of an empty town, a very thin appearance on his birthday, and the reason some fools near his person gave for people not being more richly dressed, which was, that they kept their fine clothes for the Prince's wedding. Sir Robert Walpole being to go to Norfolk with a great deal of company for three weeks, as he used to do at this time of the year, to the hunting congress (as it was called), was another circumstance which, as it contributed to thin the town, and particularly the levees and drawing-rooms, contributed too to sharpen His Majesty's temper, whose edge, whenever it was whetted, was seldom put in a sheath.

Sir Robert Walpole was at present in such high favour, on things going so well abroad, that he had only now and then his skin a little razed by this edge when it was sharpest, whilst others were sliced and scarified all over. Sir Robert Walpole, too, the King said, speaking on this present epidemical rural madness, he could forgive going into the country. His mind, His Majesty said, wanted relaxation, and his body exercise; and it was very reasonable that he should have a month in the year to look after his own private business, when all the rest of the year he was doing that of the public and his Prince. But what the other puppies and fools had to do to be running out of town now, when they had had the whole summer to do their silly business in, he could not conceive.

When the Duke of Newcastle, among the rest, asked his leave to go into the country, His Majesty pretended to take it upon another foot and said: "With all my heart,

1735 my Lord, since Walpole is going, I wish you would all go and leave me a little in quiet, that I might not hear of a letter, or a despatch, or any business, till he comes back again."

When the Duke of Grafton notified his design to go into the country, the King told him it was a pretty occupation for a man of quality, and at his age, to be spending all his time in tormenting a poor fox, that was generally a much better beast than any of those that pursued him; for the fox hurts no other animal but for his subsistence, whilst those brutes who hurt him did it only for the pleasure they took in hurting. The Duke of Grafton said he did it for his health. The King asked him why he could not as well walk or ride post for his health; and said, if there was any pleasure in the chase, he was sure the Duke of Grafton could know nothing of it; "for, with your great corps of twenty stone weight, no horse, I am sure," added His Majesty, "can carry you within hearing, much less within sight, of your hounds." This last dialogue I was present at. The Duke of Newcastle's was from Sir Robert Walpole.

Lord Harrington stayed in town, but fared not much better than those who went into the country; for though he had lost himself with the Queen by his neglect of her, and the separate court he had long, but particularly this last summer at Hanover, made to the King, yet he possessed not a much greater degree of favour with the one than the other, and the only difference between the manner in which they each of them felt to his Lordship was, that to the contempt they both had for his capacity the Queen joined a constant dislike from resentment, the King often a casual one from temper; but as the King was not so solicitous to conceal that he was not gained by Lord Harrington's applications as the Queen was to disguise her being piqued at them, so this unskilful statesman and awkward courtier was perpetually snubbed by the King, who had only no regard for him, and perpetually caressed

by the Queen, who had an utter aversion to him. For so great was the difference between the King's command of his temper and the Queen's, that, whereas he would often kick whilst he obliged, she would stroke while she hated. 1735

Lord Harrington's behaviour to Sir Robert Walpole was to the full as extraordinary and as impolitic as his conduct to the Queen, and in one very material article much more so, for, as he owed the seals to Sir Robert Walpole, as much as any clerk in the Treasury owed his employment to him, so towards Sir Robert Walpole there was not only a want of policy in Lord Harrington's conduct, but a want of gratitude.

Most people thought, and I believe justly, that Lord Chesterfield, working on that self-sufficient pride of Lord Harrington's which made him think himself the fittest man in this kingdom for a First Minister, had put him upon undertaking to make himself so by a separate interest with the King. Not that I imagine Lord Chesterfield, after the experience of his own disgrace, Lord Wilmington's miscarriage, Lord Townshend's removal, and Lady Suffolk's fall, thought this scheme was practicable; but his Lordship, having a greater desire to annoy and give trouble to those he hated, though but for a month, than he had to avoid the ruin of his best friends for ever, and thinking that this might give the Queen and Sir Robert Walpole some disturbance, though he could not flatter himself it would do them any essential hurt, set Lord Harrington on to this attack, though he knew the mines that were ready to spring under his friend and kinsman's feet, and the great probability there was of his being blown up.

Two instances of Lord Harrington's injudicious pride and simple conduct with regard to Sir Robert Walpole I cannot help relating just as Sir Robert the other day related them to me. The one was his telling Sir Robert Walpole he intended to ask the King for an earldom and desiring, not Sir Robert's interest to obtain it, but that

1735 Sir Robert would speak of it to the King as a thing that ought to be done for him; the other was desiring Sir Robert Walpole to procure him a reversional grant for life of Richmond Park, though Sir Robert, with regard to the first, told his Lordship that the King's reluctance to make promotions of this sort had prevented him hitherto asking for an earldom for his own son, and, as an earldom for his family was a thing he owned he wished to procure, so the first demand of this kind that he would make to His Majesty should certainly be for a Walpole; and as to Richmond Park, Sir Robert Walpole said, he had it himself only during pleasure, and that it would be very odd for him to ask a thing of the Crown in reversion for another in a more ample manner than he possessed it himself; and could not help saying, that to ask it at all for another, all circumstances considered, would not be very agreeable to him, nor indeed to have it granted.

Lord Harrington, notwithstanding his first onset was parried in this manner, pursued his demands, and urged many good reasons, as he thought, to prove the fitness of them; and had the imprudence, in riding about the park, near which he had a house, to talk always to the keepers of the alterations he intended, when he should be master of it, to make there; which discourses the keepers never failed to repeat, at least as strongly as they were first spoken, in mockery to Sir Robert.

But to return to the palace. The King, who never used to be civil to the Queen, even when he was kind, was now abominably and perpetually so harsh and rough, that she could never speak one word uncontradicted, nor do any one act unreprieved; and though the Queen, whilst she knew the King's heart was as warm to her as his temper, could, for the sake of the agreeable advantages she reaped from the one, support and forgive the irksome inconveniences she was exposed to from the other, yet now the case was altered, for, as his heart grew cooler and his temper warmer, so her sufferings were increased, and the

usual recompense for them lessened. In the midst of this 1735
his disagreeable behaviour towards her, she one morning,
smiling, to conceal her real concern, and to avoid seriously
reproaching him, said to him, just as he was going out of
her apartment to his own side, that, as Sir Robert Walpole
had always been her friend, and that he was the single
person in the Court who seemed at present in any degree
of favour with His Majesty, she would apply to him to
speak a word in her behalf, and try if he could get the
rigour of her present treatment a little softened. The
King was so far from taking or returning this joke that,
with eyes which always swelled and widened with eager-
ness and grew as red as other people's cheeks when he was
angry, he said he did not know what she meant by these
complaints, nor what rigour he had exercised towards
her. "I am very ill, and I believe nobody is in the same
good-humour sick as well; and in the next place, if I was
well, do you think I should not feel and show some un-
easiness for having left a place where I was pleased and
happy all day long, and being come to one where I am as
incessantly crossed and plagued?" To which the Queen,
changing the tone of voice in which she had begun this
expostulation, and answering in his own, asked him, if he
was so happy at Hanover, why he did not stay there.
"I see no reason," she said, "that made your coming to
England necessary; you might have continued there,
without coming to torment yourself and us, since your
pleasure did not call you; I am sure your business did not,
for we could have done that just as well without you as
you could have pleased yourself without us." Upon which
the King, in a great huff, trembling with passion, and
without a word in reply, went out of the room.

I relate this conversation just as Sir Robert Walpole
told it to me, and as he said the Queen told it to him; but
I am apt to believe either he embellished in repeating this
incident, or she bragged in reporting it. At least I am sure
the smartness of her last speech, thus represented, was

1735 very little of a piece with the rest of her conduct during these turbulent times, since whenever, in public or private, I have seen her with the King, she has always behaved with the obsequiousness of the most patient slave to the most intemperate master; returned every injury with flattery, and every contradiction with acquiescences; crouched when he spurned, and, with the implicit resignation of the most rigid Christian, whenever he smote one cheek turned the other.

I cannot resist giving here, by way of specimen, an account of one conversation between her and him and Lord Hervey, whilst the circumstances of it are yet fresh in his memory.

About nine o'clock every night the King used to return to the Queen's apartment from that of his daughters, where, from the time of Lady Suffolk's disgrace, he used to pass those evenings he did not go to the opera or play at quadrille, constraining them, tiring himself, and talking a little bawdy to Lady Deloraine, who was always of the party.

At his return to the Queen's side the Queen used often to send for Lord Hervey to entertain them till they retired, which was generally at eleven. One evening among the rest, as soon as Lord Hervey came into the room, the Queen, who was knotting whilst the King walked backwards and forwards, began jocosely to attack Lord Hervey upon an answer just published to a book¹ of his friend Bishop Hoadly's on the Sacrament, in which the Bishop was very ill-treated; but before she had uttered half what she had a mind to say, the King interrupted her, and told her she always loved talking of such nonsense and things she knew nothing of; adding that if it were not for such foolish people loving to talk of those things when they were written, the fools who wrote upon them would never think of publishing their nonsense, and disturbing the

¹*A plain Account of the Nature and End of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.*

Government with impertinent disputes that nobody of 1735 any sense ever troubled himself about. The Queen bowed, and said, "Sir, I only did it to let Lord Hervey know that his friend's book had not met with that general approbation he had pretended." "A pretty fellow for a friend!" said the King, turning to Lord Hervey. "Pray what is it that charms you in him? His pretty limping gait" (and then he acted the Bishop's lameness), "or his nasty stinking breath?—phaugh!—or his silly laugh, when he grins in your face for nothing, and shows his nasty rotten teeth? Or is it his great honesty that charms your Lordship? His asking a thing of me for one man and, when he came to have it in his own power to bestow, refusing the Queen to give it to the very man for whom he had asked it? Or do you admire his conscience that makes him now put out a book that, till he was Bishop of Winchester, for fear his conscience might hurt his preferment, he kept locked up in his chest? Is his conscience so much improved beyond what it was when he was Bishop of Bangor, or Hereford, or Salisbury, for this book, I hear, was written so long ago? Or was it that he would not risk losing a shilling a year more whilst there was anything better to be got than what he had? My Lord, I am very sorry you choose your friends so ill; but I cannot help saying, if the Bishop of Winchester is your friend, you have a great puppy and a very dull fellow and a great rascal for your friend. It is a very pretty thing for such scoundrels, when they are raised by favour so much above their desert, to be talking and writing their stuff, to give trouble to the Government that has showed them that favour; and very modest in a canting hypocritical knave to be crying, 'The kingdom of Christ is not of this world,' at the same time that he, as Christ's ambassador, receives £6,000 or £7,000 a year. But he is just the same thing in the Church that he is in the Government, and as ready to receive the best pay for preaching the Bible, though he does not believe a word of it, as he is to take favours from the Crown, though, by his

1735 republican spirit and doctrine, he would be glad to abolish the power of it."

During the whole time the King was speaking, the Queen, by smiling and nodding in proper places, endeavoured all she could, but in vain, to make her court by seeming to approve everything he said; and well, indeed, might she approve it, for it was almost word for word what she had said to Lord Hervey on this subject in the summer when the book first came out, which Lord Hervey, to flatter her, whilst she flattered the King, gave her to understand he remembered, by telling her very emphatically, when she asked him what he had to say to all this, "Your Majesty knows already all I have to say on this subject"; and then added (to sweeten the King), "but how partial soever I may be to my friend, I assure Your Majesty I am not so partial to myself as to imagine, let his cause be ever so good, that I should be able to plead it with success against the very able counsel that I have just now heard draw up the charge on the other side."

He then, in order to turn the conversation, told the King that he had that day been with a Bishop of a very different stamp, who would never, he dared to answer for him, disturb His Majesty's Government with writing. The man he meant was one Wilcocks, Bishop of Rochester, the dullest branch of episcopacy, and the most ignorant piece of orthodoxy, in the whole kingdom. "As soon," continued Lord Hervey, "as Lord Wilmington, Lord Chancellor, and I, had to-day discharged Your Majesty's commission in proroguing the Parliament, my Lord of Rochester carried us to Westminster Abbey to show us a pair of old brass gates to Henry VII.'s Chapel, which were formerly overrun with rust and turned quite black, but are now new-cleaned, as bright as when they were first made, and the finest things of the kind I ever saw in my life." Whilst Lord Hervey was going on with a particular detail and encomium on these gates, the Queen asking many questions about them, and seeming extremely pleased with the

description, the King stopped the conversation short by 1735 saying: "My Lord, you are always putting some of these fine things in the Queen's head, and then I am to be plagued with a thousand plans and workmen." Then turning to the Queen, he said, "I suppose I shall see a pair of these gates to Merlin's Cave, to complete your nonsense there." (This Merlin's Cave was a little building so christened, which the Queen had lately finished at Richmond.¹) The Queen smiled, and said Merlin's Cave was complete already; and Lord Hervey, to remove the King's fears of this expense, said that it was a sort of work that if His Majesty would give all the money in his exchequer he could not have now. "A propos," said the Queen, "I hear the Craftsman has abused Merlin's Cave." "I am very glad of it," interrupted the King: "you deserve to be abused for such childish silly stuff, and it is the first time I ever knew the scoundrel in the right."

This the Queen swallowed too, and began to talk on something else, till the conversation (I know not by what transition) fell on the ridiculous expense it was to people, by the money given to servants, to go and stay two or three days with their acquaintance in the country; upon which the Queen said she had found it a pretty large expense this summer to visit her friends even in town. "That is your own fault," said the King; "for my father, when he went to people's houses in town, never was fool enough to be giving away his money." The Queen pleaded

¹"The building in question was designed by Kent and was by no means a cave but a thatched house with small gothic windows and furnished with bookcases. At one end were six waxen figures large as life: Merlin and his secretary writing at a table and two female personages standing on one hand and two on the other, representing the Queen of Henry VII., Queen Elizabeth, and two characters out of Ariosto, who celebrated the House of Este, from which the House of Brunswick descended. This unintelligible puppet-show of which Stephen Duck, the thresher-poet, patronised by Queen Caroline, was Librarian, was demolished in the present reign." (Horace Walpole's Notes to "The Heroic Epistle to Sir William Chambers," edited by Paget Toynbee, Clarendon Press, 1926.)

1735 for her excuse that she had only done what Lord Grantham had told her she was to do; to which His Majesty replied, that my Lord Grantham was a pretty director; that she was always asking some fool or other what she was to do; and that none but a fool would ask another fool's advice. The Queen then appealed to Lord Hervey whether it was not now as customary to give money in town as in the country. He knew it was not, but said it was. He added, too, that to be sure, were it not so for particulars, it would certainly be expected from Her Majesty. To which the King said, "Then she may stay at home, as I do. You do not see me running into every puppy's house, to see his new chairs and stools. Nor is it for you," said he, addressing himself to the Queen, "to be running your nose everywhere, and trotting about the town to every fellow that will give you some bread and butter, like an old girl that loves to go abroad, no matter where, or whether it be proper or no." The Queen coloured, and knotted a good deal faster during this speech than she did before, whilst the tears came into her eyes, but she said not one word. Lord Hervey (who cared not whether he provoked the King's wrath himself or not, provided he could have the merit to the Queen of diverting His Majesty's ill-humour from her) said to the King, that, as the Queen loved pictures, there was no way of seeing a collection but by going to people's houses. "And what matter whether she sees a collection or not?" replied the King. "The matter is, Sir, that she satisfies her own curiosity, and obliges the people whose houses she honours with her presence." "Supposing," said the King, "she had a curiosity to see a bawdy house or a tavern, would it be fit for her to satisfy it? and yet the bawd or the innkeeper would be very glad to see her." "If the bawd and the innkeeper," replied Lord Hervey, "were used to be well received by Her Majesty in her palace, I should think the Queen's seeing them at their own houses would give no additional scandal." The King, instead of answering Lord Hervey, then turned to

the Queen, and, with a good deal of vehemence, poured 1735
out an unintelligible torrent of German, to which the
Queen made not one word of reply, but knotted on till
she tangled her thread, then snuffed the candles that
stood on the table before her, and snuffed one of them
out; upon which the King, in English, began a new dis-
sertation upon Her Majesty, and took her awkwardness
for his text.

The account of this conversation upon paper swells
into so great a length that I shall enumerate no more
particulars; what I have said will suffice for a sample of
this conference, and this conference for a sample of many
more of the same kind.

The Queen commended Lord Hervey's behaviour
extremely to the Princess Caroline, who told him of it
again; and next morning, when the Queen saw him, she
told him, smiling: "Our conversation last night was ad-
mirable; but I think you looked at me once as if you
thought I was ready to cry." Lord Hervey, who knew
the Queen had no mind he should think she was much
hurt at what had passed, said Her Majesty did not use
to interpret looks so ill; and that he was so far from look-
ing towards her and thinking her ready to cry, that he
looked a contrary way, concluding her ready to laugh,
and for fear, if he had met her eyes, that they might both
have misbehaved.

In short, at this time the Prince, who was not upon a
foot of being spoken to by his father, was the only person
who did not taste of his ill-humour, and, though he was
most of all in his displeasure, he least of all felt the effects
of it. As the King hated, too, to talk of him almost as
much as to talk to him, and disliked to have him the
subject of his conversation almost as much as he did to
have him the object of his sight, so he was as little apt to
rail at him directly when he was absent as to snub him
when he was present; though by a side-wind sometimes
he took the pleasure of laying it on him pretty thick. The

1735 Queen one night speaking of a man that had been ill-used and behaved ill in a fray at the playhouse, the King said: "I suppose nobody knows such a scoundrel." To which the Queen replied, his name was Bray, and that the King knew his father very well. "His father," said the King, "might be a very worthy man, though his son is a puppy. One very often sees fathers and sons very little alike; a wise father has very often a fool for his son. One sees a father a very brave man, and his son a scoundrel; a father very honest, and his son a great knave; a father a man of truth, and his son a great liar; in short, a father that has all sorts of good qualities, and a son that is good for nothing." But His Majesty drew this picture of a father and a son with so much eagerness, complimenting the one so strongly, and inveighing against the other so vehemently, that the Queen, though a good deal mistress of her countenance, looking towards Lord Hervey, betrayed that she took the parallel as it was meant; and the King himself, feeling he had pushed it too far, turned off the ridicule he thought he had incurred with quickness enough, by saying that sometimes it was just the reverse, and that very disagreeable fathers had very agreeable men for their sons. I suppose in this case he thought of his own father, as in the other he did of his own son.

One morning whilst he was dressing, before the company was let in, and when nobody but those who had the privilege of the bedchamber were present, he indulged himself in another sally of this kind against his son, by saying, whilst he was talking of the actors that he had seen in the play of Harry the Fourth the night before, that there were some really very good ones, but for the Prince of Wales, he must own he never saw so awkward a fellow and so mean a looking scoundrel in his life. Everybody who was present, I believe, had the same thought, but all very properly pretended to understand His Majesty literally, joined in the censure, and abused the theatrical Prince of Wales for a quarter of an hour together.

The Queen and the Prince were at this time, to all appearance, upon much better terms together than they had been for a long time past, and never really worse than they had been all the summer. But I believe one might apply to their present intimacy a thing the Queen herself said about this time of her son's correspondence with Lord Chesterfield, which was that, let the appearances of confidence be ever so strong, she would answer for it that each of them knew the other too well to love or trust one another. And, I dare say, the mother and the son were quite as well acquainted as the Prince was with the Lord. 1735

Lord Chesterfield, however, used to throw out frequent intimations to all his acquaintance of his being extremely in the Prince's favour. When Lord Hervey told Sir Robert Walpole that Lord Chesterfield bragged that it was he had married the Prince, Sir Robert looked very significantly and said: "Is he married?" Lord Hervey replied, he understood that question, and the manner of asking it; "but I believe," said he, "you will find Their Majesties have overshot themselves on this occasion. When they talked of this match first, I imagined, like you, that they certainly never designed to conclude it. But they will do by this wedding as Cardinal Fleury did by the war: they will, without intending to go on, be step by step brought so far that they will not be able to avoid it." Sir Robert said, and I believe truly, that he could not tell how it would be, for that the King and Queen had never consulted him in anything relating to this marriage, nor communicated their intentions with regard to any particular that was to be previous or consequential to it. But it is certain that the King had by the Queen offered to marry the Prince to the ugly, crooked, and not very young, Princess of Denmark, whom the Prince refused, and said she was offered him only because it was known he would refuse and ought to refuse her. It is certain too that the King did see the Princess of Saxe-Gotha this summer at Herrenhausen; and it is said too that he intends to demand

1735 her for the Prince, and has already more than intimated this design to her brother and his own son.

Many people as well as Sir Robert Walpole doubted whether they did design to marry their son or not; though they had carried this grimace, if they did not design it, so far as to build an apartment at St. James's for the reception of this future Princess of Wales, had bought jewels to present her, and actually had made their wedding-clothes. But when these circumstances were told to the sceptics and infidels on this occasion, answer was made that cradles and clothes for the Princess Royal's child had been made, but she was never brought to bed.

Since I have mentioned the Princess Royal, I will say two or three words of her present disagreeable situation. By growing very fat she became every day less likely to have children; her Court grew duller and duller, her husband poorer and poorer, and his interest in Holland weaker and weaker; hers in her husband kept pace with her husband's in the state; and for the finishing stroke in the mortification of her pride, he was thought to be in love with Miss Schutz, one of her maids of honour, to whom she had always been particularly kind for the sake both of the girl and of her father.

The Princess Royal saw the King in his way from Hanover to England, though she had had the mortification of not seeing him when he went thither; but the short comfort of barely seeing him was the only comfort she enjoyed in this interview, for no money, no hopes of coming to England, nor any promises of assisting her husband in Holland, were given her, nor were there any other consequences attending this meeting than her returning to the ennui from which she came.

But there was a circumstance at this juncture known to but few people, which gave the Queen and Sir Robert Walpole, and those who wished well to either of them, more trouble than all the other effects of His Majesty's ill-humour put together, though the Queen always denied

believing it. This circumstance was His Majesty's having 1735 given his word to Madame Walmoden to return to Hanover by the 29th of May next summer; which promise being known to all her friends, the night before His Majesty left Hanover, Madame Walmoden, at supper, in a mixture of tears and smiles, toasted the 29th of May, which all the rest of the company pledged in a bumper.

The King had never yet, that I could learn, given the least hint of this intention to anybody on this side of the water; I am sure he had not to the Queen or Sir Robert Walpole; and Lord Harrington, I believe, had been as close upon this subject as his master. It was told to Lord Hervey by Mr. Poyntz, who I guess had it from one Weston, a great friend of his, a sensible fellow, and *commis* to Lord Harrington. When Lord Hervey told it to Sir Robert Walpole, Sir Robert seemed at first much surprised and concerned; and afterwards said: "But he shan't go for all that. His Majesty imagines frequently he shall do many things, which, because he is not first contradicted, he fancies he shall be let to do at last. He thinks he is devilish stout, and never gives up his will or his opinion; but he never acts in anything material according to either of them but when I have a mind he should. I am going, my Lord, to make an odd declaration for a minister, for generally it is the policy of ministers to throw the blame of everything wrong done on their master; but I am willing to own, whenever our master does wrong, it is the fault of his ministers, who must either want resolution enough to oppose him, or sense enough to do it with success. Our master, like most people's masters, wishes himself absolute, and fancies he has courage enough to attempt making himself so; but if I know anything of him he is, with all his personal bravery, as great a political coward as ever wore a crown, and as much afraid to lose it."

How Sir Robert could reconcile this speech with his keeping up such an army in England, and in the present

1735 circumstances of England, I know not; or how he would be able to justify this measure in private without disavowing in some degree the other assertion, I am quite at a loss to guess. However, Lord Hervey knew too well how little anybody likes to have such puzzling questions put to them to desire Sir Robert to clear up this matter.

The King gave other very strong marks at this time of his fondness for Madame Walmoden, which were as little known here as the promise he had made of returning to Hanover; one of which the Queen knew, but was ashamed to tell even to Sir Robert Walpole. This was that His Majesty, who till this year always used to stay with the Queen in a morning till after he had had the military amusement of peeping through the cane-blinds of the windows to see the guard relieved, which was hardly ever finished till eleven o'clock, did now forego that joy as well as the pleasures of his wife's conversation, and went every morning to his own side by nine o'clock or a little after, where he constantly wrote for two or three hours to Madame Walmoden, who never failed sending and receiving a letter every post.

Oct. 3 Soon after the King came to England the remarkable and important news arrived that the preliminary articles to a general peace were signed at Vienna by the Emperor and France, and that in consequence of the conclusion of this treaty, a cessation of arms had been declared at the head of the Imperial and French armies on the Rhine, as well as in Italy. The armistice was published in Italy just as the Duke de Montemar was going to urge the siege of Mantua with his utmost vigour, but upon this mortifying and unexpected news he made his retreat not only from the Mantuan, but deserted also Parma and Placentia; for, after evacuating those duchies of the troops, gutting the palaces of all the moveables, and carrying off everything he found portable, he withdrew into Tuscany in order to fortify himself there and prevent the Imperialists from penetrating into that country and taking possession

of it according to the stipulations of this new-concluded 1735
treaty, the articles of which were in substance as follows:

1. France shall restore to the Empire all the places which she has taken from it during the war.

2. The Emperor shall have the Mantuan, Parma, Placentia, and the Milanese; Vigevanese and Novaro and their dependencies excepted, which shall be given to the King of Sardinia, with the liberty of building fortresses in what part of these countries he shall at any time think proper.

3. The Duchy of Tuscany, after the death of the present Grand Duke, shall be given to the Duke of Lorraine, at which time Lorraine shall be put into the hands of His Most Christian Majesty, and remain annexed to his monarchy.

4. King Stanislaus shall be acknowledged by all the Powers of Europe King of Poland, and shall enjoy all the honours and prerogatives of a crowned head; after which he shall resign voluntarily the possession of the kingdom of Poland in favour of King Augustus, who shall restore to him all the estates in Poland which either belonged to him or to his Queen.

5. King Stanislaus shall have, by way of equivalent for Poland, the immediate possession of the duchy of Barr.

6. Don Carlos shall be acknowledged King of Naples and Sicily, and shall have the State of del Presidii, with the island of Elba; as for Leghorn, it shall be declared a free port.

7. France shall guarantee the Pragmatic Sanction.

8. The Kings of Spain and Sardinia to be invited to accede to this treaty; and England, Holland, Portugal, and Venice to guarantee it.

The Court of Spain was so incensed at the conclusion of this treaty that Her Catholic Majesty would not permit the French Minister at her Court for some time to obtain an audience to communicate it. All the letters and despatches from Spain to every Court in Europe were full of nothing but the strongest invectives against the conduct of France, reproaching her with the basest treachery and perfidy to her allies, the blindest ignorance of her own interest, and treating her as the weak and wicked dupe of the Court of Vienna.

All this outcry was on account of the disposition made by this treaty of the Duchy of Tuscany, which Her

1735 Spanish Majesty had cut out by way of appanage for Don Philip, second of her three sons. The first, as actual King of Naples, and as presumptive heir to the Crown of Spain, she thought not ill provided for; and her third son, Don Lewis, though but seven years old, being, by her assiduity at the Court of Rome, just confirmed Archbishop of Toledo, with a revenue of about 100,000 pistoles a year, and made a cardinal, she was in no great anxiety for a further provision for His Royal and Eminent Highness the Cardinal of Bourbon, for this was the new title by which Don Lewis was now styled.

This delicious morsel, therefore, of the Duchy of Tuscany, so long designed by Her Spanish Majesty for her second son, Don Philip, being now otherwise disposed of, was what she could not brook, and what she was determined, before she would submit, to try all the force of negotiation at least to prevent.

The English Ministers, knowing the storm this treaty would raise at Madrid whenever it came to be divulged, had very wisely worked at it as mediators between France and the Emperor, without making England a party, or appearing openly enough in the transaction to give Spain a just handle for public reproach; though Spain must know too well the true state of the case not to feel some dissatisfaction, and utter some private complaint.

There was great deliberation and various opinions in the Cabinet Council on the wording the first letters that were sent to Spain after this great event. Sir Robert Walpole had been all along very prudently (though almost singly in his opinion) for letting the English Administration stand the reproach and ridicule of its enemies at home for having had no hand in this treaty, in order to avoid the displeasure and reproaches England must necessarily have incurred at the Court of Madrid, if the part England took in this transaction had publicly appeared.

But the use Sir Robert would have made afterward of this policy was, in the opinion of most people who were

acquainted with this transaction, encroaching too far on 1735
the real fact; and, in the representation he would have
made of it, giving up too much of his veracity to his
dexterity.

The words which he would have inserted in this despatch to the Court of Spain, in speaking of this treaty, were "a treaty set on foot without the consent of England, and concluded without our PARTICIPATION." As to the former part of this sentence, nobody cavilled at it, as it was certainly true, though impudently denied by the Cardinal, that a private treaty between the Courts of Vienna and Versailles had been entered into, without England being called in either as an umpire or an assistant. But these two great and proud powers, finding it difficult to bend to the making such concessions to one another as they thought they might with honour submit to on the solicitation of a mediator, were forced to break off this private treaty, and call England in to facilitate the progress of a new negotiation.¹

The former part, therefore, of Sir Robert Walpole's words was agreed to; but the great dispute was on the word "participation"; and if I were to recite all I heard said on this occasion, I might fill as many volumes of verbal criticisms on this word "participation" as any Dacier or Bentley ever wrote on Homer or Horace; but it not being my design to tire my readers with such critical lumber, nor my inclination to fatigue myself with greater trouble of writing what I suffered so much trouble in hearing, I shall repeat nothing more of this ten days' dispute on the word "participation," than that Sir Robert, though seconded by nobody but Lord Ilay, insisted on its standing, and left the care of this favourite word, when he went into Norfolk, to the Duke of Newcastle, who,

¹Vaucher, *Walpole et la politique de Fleury*, shows that the British government were carefully excluded by Fleury not only from participation, but, so far as he was concerned, from all knowledge of the negotiation which led to the conclusion of this treaty.

1735 proving as ready to give up any other body's sense as he was to maintain his own nonsense, abandoned his charge, suffered "participation" to be erased out of the despatch, and the more explicit term of "concluded without England's being a party" to be inserted in its stead.

The Queen of Spain, pretending not to see what she was not at present in a condition to resent, applauded our having lent no aid to the contravention of former treaties subsisting between Spain and England; reminded us of our guarantee of Parma, Placentia, and the succession of Tuscany, to Don Carlos; and said it would be very hard her son should be obliged to quit those rich possessions and succession for the kingdoms of Naples and Sicily, where the Imperialists had not left a ducat.

In answer to this, the Court of England reminded Her Catholic Majesty that we were equally guarantees for Naples and Sicily to the Emperor, notwithstanding which Spain had, without our consent, attacked and subdued them; and that it would be very unreasonable and unjust for Spain to expect to avail itself of our guarantee in one case, when it had shown so little regard to it in the other; but, however, if Spain thought itself aggrieved and prejudiced by the exchange of Parma, Placentia, and Tuscany, for the Two Sicilies, our Court declared England was very ready to consent to return again to the treaty of Seville, and put the possessions of Italy under the same sovereigns to whom by those stipulations they stood allotted.

The King of Sardinia was the worst used of anybody in this treaty, but he knew it was to no purpose to complain, and was therefore silent. He had disobliged every power in Europe by the alliance he had made with France; France had betrayed him, and no power in Europe espoused his cause.

But if the Court of France knew, as I conclude it did know, that the King of Sardinia would have joined the

Emperor, provided England would have gone into the war, France, I suppose, would have had few qualms in giving up an ally who only continued so because his overtures of desertion had not been accepted. 1735

The reason why the King of Sardinia had made this overture was that Spain had refused to yield the Milanese to His Sardinian Majesty, according to the tenor of the treaty between him and France; and by the whole conduct of France the King of Sardinia found France would rather lean to the interest and yield to the importunity of Spain than fulfil their engagements and maintain him.

As to France betraying Spain to the Emperor in this treaty, France certainly knew that the Queen of Spain had been tampering at Vienna; and if she could have secured the possession of her conquests for Don Carlos by a marriage with one of the Emperor's daughters, and settled by treaty what she had acquired by arms, the Cardinal was very sure she would then have given the same cause of complaint to France that she now pretended to receive from thence, and would have been the injurer instead of the injured; for which reason France felt as few scruples and as little remorse in sacrificing the Court of Spain as in abandoning that of Turin; or, to speak more properly, as little as national consciences ever feel when they sacrifice their faith to their interest, and have nothing to fear from those they injure but reproaches.

But as the Cardinal was not at liberty publicly to own he knew of this transaction, so he only gave hints of it at the Court of Spain, whilst the excuse he pleaded there for his conduct was, that the opposition Spain had made, from its boundless ambition, to the suffering France to fulfil its engagements to the King of Sardinia by putting him in possession of the Milanese, and the dissensions he foresaw must result from that point, was the principal consideration that had driven him into this measure, in order to take advantage of the weakness of the common enemy before the jealousies and divisions of the Allies

1735 had weakened them enough to let the Emperor regain by their quarrels what he had lost by their union.

In this manner was this formidable Triple Alliance of Spain, France, and Sardinia, that had for these three last years struck terror into all Europe, at last dissolved. But I cannot make use of that expression of "Triple Alliance," as it was always called, without observing how improperly it was thus nominated: for though France had a treaty that united her with both, yet to the treaty subsisting between France and Sardinia, Spain had never acceded, and to that between France and Spain, Sardinia had never acceded; nor did Spain and Sardinia bear greater enmity to the foe against whom they seemed united than to one another; so that the philosopher's rule of *quæ conveniunt in eodem tertio conveniunt inter se* was never more strongly contradicted than in the connection of these three powers.

Almost from the very beginning of their union it was very plain to those who knew the true anecdotes of the times—the courier and cabinet history of this war—that there was not one of these three powers who did not mean to make dupes of the other two, and take advantage of their own strength at the expense of the others' interest. France only indeed could betray both, as she only was in league with both; and this honourable privilege it is impossible for anybody to accuse her of not exercising to the fullest extent, leaving to all posterity so memorable a mark of Gallic faith, that the Punic, antiquated by this modern example, need no longer be proverbial.

The Queen, who had certainly a great deal of wit, and was a most entertaining companion, used very justly, as well as agreeably, to say that this Triple Alliance always put her in mind of the South Sea scheme, which the parties concerned entered into not without knowing the cheat, but hoping to make advantage of it, everybody designing, when he had made his own fortune, to be the first in scrambling out of it, and each thinking himself wise

enough to be able to leave his fellow-adventurers in the 1735 lurch.

But this being a secret known only to a few ministerial brokers in these fraudulent bargains, the conduct of France, even with regard to Spain and Sardinia, upon the making of this separate peace, appeared in no very honourable light to mankind in general; and with regard to every other power that had favoured her cause, her conduct stood certainly wholly unjustifiable to all the world, and will remain so to all posterity as long as that phantom, national faith, shall have any regard paid to its appearance, and till all private people come to own that national faith ought to be considered no more than it is plain princes and ministers do consider it.

If France was to be asked why she abandoned Spain, broke her treaties with Sardinia, and betrayed both, she would answer, perhaps, that they attempted to do the same thing by her, and that her crime was nothing more than theirs, only more manifested by having better success.

But if she was to be asked why she abandoned, in that shameless manner, the father-in-law of her King after making his interest the sole plea for entering into this war; why she so dishonourably neglected all the nobility of Poland who espoused his cause; why she suffered the Danzigers to be ruined for adhering to the same interest; why she paid so little regard to her treaties with Sweden, with the Elector of Bavaria, and with the Elector Palatine; what could France answer but that she had got the reversion of Lorraine, and looked on that acquisition as an equivalent for all the reproach she had incurred?

Various were the sentiments and language of the people in England on the consummation of this very important transaction. All whose interests were interwoven, or whose dependencies were in any manner linked, with the people in power, as well as the very few who considered the interest of England detached from personal views or party considerations, rejoiced extremely at this event, and

1735 laid their encomiums on the conduct of the Administration as thick as the most devoted friends of the Minister could wish.

The opponents first took the turn of saying that the peace was concluded at Vienna between the Emperor and France without the knowledge, as well as without the assistance, of the English Ministers; but this suggestion gained credit only with a few, and even with them soon lost its force; for the articles of the present peace being drawn on the plan of accommodation of last year, and with so small a variation, if any honour was to redound to those who laid the scheme of this peace, it was impossible not to allow some share of it to those whom the opponents, when the scheme did not take effect, were so ready to reproach and ridicule as the sole authors and projectors of such wild and unsuccessful folly.

The opponents then asked a few invidious questions, and said they knew no way of computing the advantage of any transaction but by the benefit of its effects; and as, at Carthage, after Hannibal had sent the news of the battle of Cannæ and the advantages he had gained in Italy over the Romans, Hanno asked in what particular these advantages were apparent, whether Rome was unable to continue the war, whether she sued for peace, whether Hannibal did not want more men, and whether he did not want more money, so, on the conclusion of this boasted peace, the patriot opponents demanded in what England was to be the better for it, whether we were to be disentangled from all our former engagements, and, if we were, whether we were to be involved in no new ones, whether Spain and Sardinia would accede to this treaty, or whether England was to be made a party to force them, whether our fleet was to be recalled from Portugal, whether our army was to be reduced, or our vast expenses lessened, and whether it was the interest of England to weaken Spain in order to strengthen France, or to disoblige the first, only to ingratiate ourselves with the last.

These were topics of declamation for the faction in 1735 general, but the sensible part of the Opposition saw too plainly the advantage this occurrence would be of to the Ministry, in what manner soever it had been brought about, and whatever the measures of the Court were in consequence of it, not to mourn the success of so fortunate a negotiation. Lord Bolingbroke's dictum on this occasion was that if the English Ministers had had any hand in this peace, they had more sense than he thought they had, and, if they had not, that they had much better luck than they deserved to have. Pulteney declared it was a most fortunate event for England, and, let who will have the honour of it, he was glad this country had the benefit of it. Lord Carteret's reflection was, that he had always thought Walpole the luckiest dog that ever meddled with public affairs. And Sir William Wyndham owned it was not only a good peace for the Administration, but for the nation.

The King seemed to value himself so much on this occasion that one would have imagined every step that had been taken in order to produce this peace had been taken as much according to his inclination and his judgment as it was taken against both. The Queen was more just, and acknowledged, not only to Sir Robert Walpole himself, but to many other people, that he had, like a skilful pilot, saved us all from the storm, and brought us into a safe port, when, if it had not been for him, we had now been upon the high seas and many leagues from shore. His credit and interest at present both with the King and Queen were higher and firmer than ever; but, to do him justice, he bore his success, and acted in this plenitude of power and triumph, with great moderation.

The Duke of Newcastle's behaviour on this occasion was a little in the same style with the King's, for, though he must be conscious his part and merit with regard to the peace was such that the messenger who carried despatches of other people's writing might as well be proud of his

1735 share in this business as one who only wrote despatches of other's people's dictating, yet his Grace was so elate and so proud of this his imaginary glory, that he was more busily troublesome, more ministerially important, more haughtily familiar, more oppressively talkative, and more noisily glad, than even he had ever before appeared upon any other occurrence.

Horace Walpole returned from Holland crowned with a new sort of wreaths of triumph, for all his honours resulted from his good fortune in having two years incessantly pursued the Dutch with fruitless solicitation, in which, as paradoxical as it may sound, he most successfully miscarried, and was most beneficially disappointed; his first view having been to excite the Dutch to the war, and his labours in peace only what he was at last reduced to as the *pis aller*.

In reality, therefore, whatever advantages accrued to Europe in general, or England in particular, from this peace, were chiefly, if not solely, owing to that caution and perseverance in the Dutch which for three years together the whole Court of St. James's have been calling obstinate phlegm and infatuated blindness. And the reason why I impute this happy event of our being now out of the war to this cause is that Sir Robert Walpole himself, who alone opposed our going into the war, had put his opposition at last entirely upon that foot—that without the Dutch joining with us we could not justify going into it; and thereupon consented to send his brother to exert all his eloquence to sound the alarm, and his strongest incitements to persuade them to take it.

Whether Sir Robert Walpole put his opposition to England's engaging in the war on this issue from knowing the Dutch would never consent to be embarked in it, or whether, if they had consented, he had any after-stroke of policy and dexterity to withstand our engaging in the war, are secrets which lie, uncommunicated by him and undiscovered by me, in his own breast; but, according

to a natural judgment on the known circumstances that 1735
attended the progress of these negotiations between England and Holland, one should be apt to imagine that had Holland yielded to our importunity, instead of our submitting to her refusal, England and Holland at this moment, instead of being mediators in a general peace, had been parties in a general war, and auxiliaries in the contention instead of guarantees for the accommodation.

There was no private man so ill-treated throughout this whole negotiation as the French Minister in England, M. de Chavigny. During the progress of this transaction, till the public declaration of the armistice, he was kept in such profound ignorance of what was doing at his own Court, as well as this that, in the last audience he had of Sir Robert Walpole before he went to Hanover on the subject of the peace, he said the honour of France was so much concerned in making Stanislaus King of Poland, and driving the Emperor quite out of Italy, that, without those two fundamentals submitted to, it was impossible for France ever to listen to any terms of accommodation, by whatever hands they were proposed.

But Sir Robert Walpole, at the very time that Chavigny was giving himself these airs, had in his pocket the consent of France to treat of peace without either of these stipulations, and told Chavigny he would certainly find himself deceived; he told him so, too, with an air that implied he had more reasons to think so than he would communicate: upon which M. Chavigny began to complain of the little openness with which Sir Robert ever treated him. Sir Robert said it was not his fault that they had lived in no better intelligence, and that M. Chavigny must have too good sense to expect that, whilst he lived in such seeming intimacy with the avowed enemies and opponents to the King's measures, he could receive any marks of confidence from those who had the honour to transact them. Chavigny apologised for this conduct by saying that a stranger in any country was surely not

1735 blamable for returning any civilities he received there; and that Lord Bolingbroke, Sir William Wyndham, and Mr. Pulteney, had shown him so many, that he neither could nor ought to decline living with them in a familiar way as a private man; and that, as a public minister, or with regard to politics, he had as little communication with them as if they never saw one another at all. These sort of evasions passed on Sir Robert Walpole for just as much as they were worth, and this expostulation between him and M. Chavigny ended as most expostulations of this kind must do, where the one only excuses a coldness he is determined to continue, and the other, by justifying the conduct which has drawn it upon him, shows he intends to persevere in deserving it.

But Chavigny, though a sensible man, certainly acted injudiciously in attaching himself so firmly and so openly to the heads of the opposing party, as it must exclude him from all confidence with the people in power here, and of course in time work him out even of the confidence of his own Court; as no Ministers of one Court who desire to act efficaciously or amicably with those of another will ever intrust their negotiations to the hands of a man who has made himself obnoxious to those with whom he is to treat.

Marshal Broglio, Chavigny's predecessor, had split on this very rock; and yet the caution and circumspection of Chavigny, bred from his earliest youth in the dependence of a subaltern courtier, the intrigues of negotiation, and the vassalage of a ministerial proxy, fell into the same errors, unwarned by example, that Broglio committed, who, without any natural understanding, or any knowledge acquired from experience, was taken out of a camp and made an ambassador, when there was not a corporal or serjeant in his regiment who was not as fit for the employment.

By these means both Chavigny and Monsieur de Broglio became absolute ciphers at the Court of England, all

business between England and France being now trans- 1735
acted by Lord Waldegrave at Paris, as in the times of
Monsieur de Broglie's residence here it had been by
Horace Walpole.

In my opinion, there are very few situations in which a
foreign Minister employed at any Court can act politically
by caballing with the enemies to the people in power
there. If the nation is ripe for a revolt, or for insurrections
and civil wars, and that it is the interest of the Court by
whom that Minister is employed to foment these divi-
sions and weaken the government, he may possibly do
his master some little service by promoting such measures,
but more probably come to be ruined without doing him
any; and as to common cases, though it may be for the
honour and often even for the interest of a native to
adhere to the under party and oppose the people in power,
yet it can seldom or never be so for a foreign negotiator;
in the first place, as it excludes that foreigner immediately
from any pretence to favour, or any hope of confidence;
in the next, as an ambassador to any Court is sent to the
Crown and not to the King, to the minister and not to the
man, so whoever wears the one, and is the other, those
persons for the time being are the persons to whom an
ambassador should address himself; and the shifting his
applications as fast as the Crown changes its master, or
the King his servant, is certainly what not only in prudence
he ought to do, but what with honour he may do, how
ignominious soever the like conduct would be in a native,
who must betray the party he last acted with, and the
principles he last acted upon, to behave in that manner.

Chavigny, from reasoning differently, lost his credit at
home, and made but an indifferent figure at this time
abroad; those who had brought this disgrace upon him
being glad to publish it in whispers to forty or fifty chosen
friends, who circulated the story so generally that there
was nobody in England who knew Chavigny's name, that
did not know this peace was made without his privacy.

1735 Both the King and Queen rejoiced extremely at this slur put upon Chavigny, partly because they thought it would be construed as an instance of their influence at the Court of France, but chiefly because they hated Monsieur Chavigny personally, and were glad of any mortification he underwent. Nor can I say their Majesties' dislike to Monsieur Chavigny was ill-founded or capriciously taken. In the first place, it can never be very agreeable to any Prince to have a Minister sent to transact business at his Court, who is thought to communicate every negotiation or consultation to those of his subjects who labour to distress every measure and cross every step which that Prince designs to take. But the King and Queen had still more personal reasons for being exasperated against this Minister; for as he took all his notions of this Court from the conversation and intelligence of men who were always endeavouring to put every circumstance and person belonging to it in the most hateful as well as the most despicable light, so in despatches he sent to France, intercepted by our Ministers, the strongest and most personal invectives against the King and Queen were often discovered, and without any softening always reported to Their Majesties, which will easily be imagined to have been the case, when the reporter was one who had at least an equal share in the bitterness of the satire.

Among many examples I could from my own ocular testimony recite of these liberties taken by Chavigny with His Majesty's name and character, I shall content myself with exhibiting one only by way of sample for the rest; which, if I had not forgot to insert it in its proper place, would have been noticed in the transactions of the year 1731. The passage I mean was in one of his letters, where, speaking of the King's unpopularity in England, he added these words: "*Et quoi qu'il est bien rare qu'on puisse mépriser ceux qu'on hait, ou haïr ceux qu'on méprise, sa Majesté Britannique a trouvé moyen d'être en même temps méprisé et haï de tous ses sujets.*" When

Sir Robert Walpole showed the copy of this invective to 1735
the King, His Majesty said Chavigny lied like a fool as
well as a rascal, for that he was sure, let him be ever so
much hated, that neither his conduct nor his character
was such as made him liable to be despised; from which
Sir Robert took occasion to say many things to the King,
all tending to the making his own Court, and to fanning
the King's resentment against Chavigny, which in some
respects went much further than Sir Robert would have had
it, for the King could not be prevailed upon to speak to
Chavigny in near a year after, though Sir Robert told him
that Chavigny ought, in his opinion, either to be treated
by the King just as if this had never happened, or to be
forbidden the Court; the being as natural a consequence
of the King's being supposed to be ignorant of this letter,
as the other would be of his owning he was informed of it.
However, the King did not deviate from his usual marks
of mute resentment on such occasions, but shut his ears
to Sir Robert, and his mouth to Chavigny.

From a constant series of such intercepted reflections
in Chavigny's letters for several years, it is easy to ima-
gine that Their Majesties must have felt some satisfaction
in the disgrace they found put upon him at this time, on
the conclusion of a peace upon articles he had always
opposed, and which were at last agreed to, no more with
his confidence than with his approbation. The King, when-
ever he spoke of him at this time, exulted, insulted, and
confessed he had great joy in seeing such a scoundrel-
puppy treated as he deserved; the Queen on the other
hand, with more finesse, said to me that though she owned
it was natural for one to see with some pleasure the morti-
fications of those whom one had reason to wish mortified
and endeavoured should be so, yet that poor Chavigny
seemed to bear his mortifications so ill, that she really
suffered when she saw him; but at the same time, related
the many provocations he had given both to the King and
her. She said Chavigny had drawn her character in the

1735 letters he had written to his Court as one that was hated by the whole kingdom, had affirmed that it was notoriously known that there was nothing done but by her influence, and that her influence was never exerted but by the force of money, which she took on all hands, and for all things, in proportion to the circumstances of the solicitor and the value of the thing solicited. Her Majesty on this occasion, too, gave the whole history of Chavigny's mean birth, his low original, and first rise in the world, telling me that he was the son of a baker, that he was first employed by the Cardinal Dubois as a spy, that after that he crept up into the employment of a minor minister, was employed at Ratisbon, and disavowed by his Court in his transaction there, and that Monsieur Chauvelin, who was a great knave, chose to employ him as one he could command and countermand, trust or not trust, order and disavow, and in short, use just as he pleased.

What diverted her most, she said, was to hear the manner in which Chavigny and Lord Carteret spoke of one another, which she described, mimicking the gestures and tone of voice of each, in a much more humorous manner than I can repeat, but the substance of it was, both of them spoke of the other as such stigmatized knaves, who made profession of as little honesty or truth as they practised, that each was astonished how the other got any Court to employ him, any Minister to treat with him, or any party to receive him.

Whilst Sir Robert Walpole was in Norfolk, the King and Queen trusted chiefly to Lord Hervey to let them know what turn both the friends and foes of the Court took in their conversation relating to the peace. When the King and Queen were together he never entered into particulars, but said there seemed to be a universal satisfaction and triumph among the friends to the Government, and as general marks of sorrow and disappointment among those who were not so well inclined to it; to the Queen alone Lord Hervey told, not so acceptably as

sincerely, that the first question everybody who was best 173^c
inclined to the Government asked him was what number
of troops were to be disbanded, and when the orders for
a reduction would be issued out. The Queen, who loved
troops full as well as the King, though she did not talk
quite so much of them, seemed extremely dissatisfied with
people's showing such an impatience for this step to be
taken; and said, if they were friends to the Government
who talked in this way, that at least they were very igno-
rant and silly friends, who imagined it would be advisable
for the King to disband a man before the peace was con-
cluded. Lord Hervey said that there was certainly nothing
so odious to men of all ranks and classes in this country
as troops; that people who had not sense enough to count
twenty, or to articulate ten words together on other
subjects, had their lessons so well by heart, that they
could talk like Ciceros on this topic, and never to an audi-
ence that did not chime in with all their arguments; and
as a standing army was the thing in the world that was
most disliked in this country, so the reduction of any part
of it was a measure that always made any Prince more
popular than any other he could take. Lord Hervey added,
too, that if he had the honour to advise the Crown, he
had rather give his counsel to disband 6,000 or 8,000 men
now, and to raise 12,000 on the most frivolous pretence
six months hence, than continue the present number un-
altered, which at this time everybody would construe as a
declaration that they never were to expect to have fewer;
he said, too, that there were several people to his knowledge
in the King's service who chose to say these things any-
where rather than in the palace, and that he hoped Her
Majesty would not take it ill of him that he chose to say
them in the palace rather than anywhere else. The Queen
pressed him extremely to say who those people were,
which he absolutely refused to comply with; she then went
on to enumerate many good reasons as she thought why
no troops should be yet disbanded; among which was the

1735 uncertainty of Spain's coming into this peace, and the use it would be of to show that England was in a condition to join in forcing her; then the example was urged of the good effect our fleet had had at Lisbon in preventing a war between Spain and Portugal, with several other arguments equally unsubstantial and as unworthy to come out of any sensible unprejudiced lips as to be inserted here.

When Sir Robert Walpole came to town Lord Hervey gave him an account of this and several other conversations of the same tenor, which he had had in his absence with the Queen; telling Sir Robert at the same time how sorry he was from these symptoms to find how little probability there was that the universal expectations of mankind of some reduction of the forces being made on this occasion would be answered. Sir Robert said he did not believe the Court could be brought to consent to reduce them; and Lord Hervey replied that he believed Sir Robert would find it at least as difficult to bring the Parliament to consent to continue them. Sir Robert said those were not the things that ever hurt an Administration, for that this would only be one day's debate; that some of the young people would throw out some warm strong things in set declamations; that it would be a long day and a small majority, but the point would be carried, and there would be an end of it. Lord Hervey agreed that it would be carried, but did not agree that when it was carried there would be an end of it; on the contrary, he said, the clamour would be great and lasting; and that many of those who would not dare to vote against it would grumble at it; and, as it often happens on such occasions, would hate Sir Robert for making them incur the reproach of supporting this measure, more than even those who would load them with that reproach, as they would think the people who abused them did no more by them than what they deserved, and that he who had made them liable to that abuse had done more than he need, and put them into a disagreeable situation which he could easily have avoided.

Sir Robert said to Lord Hervey: "I do not tell you, my 1735
Lord, if I could do just as I would on this occasion, that
no troops at all should be disbanded, but believe me,
my Lord, you are too much biassed the other way; and
remember, your old friend leaves this advice with you as a
legacy when I am dead and gone, if you ever come to
govern this country and if you hope to do it in peace,
never leave it without an army, nor ever let that army at
lowest be reduced to less than 18,000 men. Believe me,
my dear Lord, the disputed title to this Crown, the
natural temper of our countrymen, the struggle there is
for power and dominion in all countries, and the licentiousness under the name of liberty that reigns in this, will,
even with 18,000 men, standing forces at your command,
leave your hands full of as much work as you can turn
them to, be as able and as dexterous and as vigilant and
circumspect as you please." Lord Hervey assured Sir
Robert, though many people wished to be many things
they were not fit for, and he perhaps among the rest, yet
the Government of this country was what he was sure he
neither did nor ever should desire, as he was very sensible
he had neither a head fit to undertake the weight of it, a
temper to submit to the constraint of it, nor a constitution
to go through the fatigue of it; that to pass a good deal
of his time alone, and to choose his company when he was
not alone, were the two things that he desired most to be
able to do as long as he lived; and that he had too sure
an example before his eyes of those two things being
impracticable to any First Minister in this country, "when
even your understanding and taste, Sir, can bring neither
of them about."

Sir Robert thanked Lord Hervey for his compliment,
and then began to inquire how the King behaved to the
Queen, whether she had gained any ground, or he lost
any of his ill-temper. Lord Hervey told him he did not
perceive either, and told him what was the true state of the
case; that the King was generally in a most abominable

1735 humour, and that the Queen was the chief mark at which all the sharpest arrows were aimed. His Lordship added, too, that if he was the Queen, he should be more exasperated still at His Majesty's good-humour than his bad, for whenever in these vicissitudes the transient fit of good-humour took its turn, it was only to relate the scenes of his happy loves when he was at Hanover, and give Her Majesty a detail of all his amorous amusements with her rival.

The suppers, the balls, the shows and masquerades, with which this son of Mars entertained his new Venus were not only the frequent topics of his private conversation with the Queen at this time, but added to this he had the goodness to bring over pictures of these scenes in fine gilt frames, to adorn the Queen's dressing-room; and was often so gracious to Lord Hervey when he was with Their Majesties in this dressing-room for an hour or two in the evening, to take a candle in his own royal hand, and tell him the story of these pictures, running through the names and characters of all the persons represented in them, and what they had said and done the whole night these entertainments had been exhibited; during which lecture Lord Hervey, whilst he was peeping over His Majesty's shoulder at these pictures, was shrugging up his own, and now and then stealing a look to make faces at the Queen, who, a little angry, a little peevish, and a little tired, with her husband's absurdity, and a little entertained with his Lordship's grimaces, used to sit and knot in a corner of the room, sometimes yawning and sometimes smiling, and equally afraid of betraying those signs either of her lassitude or her mirth.

Jan. 15,
1736 Before the Parliament met, the news came of Spain's accepting the preliminary articles; and as this took away the only poor little shadow of pretence for keeping up the same number of troops that were maintained last year, the Court was forced to consent to a reduction, and bring in the estimate for the army this year just upon the same

foot it had been before the 8,000 men were added that had 1736 been raised in consequence of the vote of credit.

The King's speech required more address than usual this year in the penning of it, as it was to be conceived in such terms as were modestly to intimate to his Parliament and people that the whole merit of making this peace belonged to him and his Ministers; and yet was not to do this so plainly as to give the lie to what the Court of England had declared at the Court of Spain, or to incur the ridicule which must have attended this piece of arrogance in every other country in which this speech would be read.

This fortunate event of the peace made the opposition to the measures of the Court this session very languid. Lord Bolingbroke's going out of England on account of the bad situation both of his public and private affairs¹ slackened, too, extremely the spirit of the public papers; and Mr. Pulteney, partly from a very ill state of health, and partly, as some people thought, from being weary of the opposing part he had so long unsuccessfully acted, withdrew himself the greatest part of the session from all attendance in the House of Commons.

Sir William Wyndham, deprived of his private prompter, Lord Bolingbroke, and his coadjutor in public action, Mr. Pulteney, made a very inconsiderable figure, and was as little useful to the party he espoused as formidable to that he opposed. Those who were inclined to flatter his understanding imputed the languor of his performances not to the loss of Lord Bolingbroke's instructions, but to his being softened to the Administration and his desiring to make his peace; and this opinion obtained so much from the manifest alteration of his behaviour in Parliament that most people imagined this peace was privately

¹Bolingbroke had for some time been in the pay of the French Government, whom he supplied with intelligence about England, and it has been conjectured that his sudden retreat may have been due to the British Government's having discovered this. (Vaucher, p. 65.)

1736 negotiating between Sir Robert Walpole and him. But there was in reality no such treaty on foot.

All the considerable debates that passed this year in Parliament were upon church matters, and Parliament, like bull-dogs, sticking close to any hold on which they have once fastened, the poor Church this winter was as much worried as Sir Robert had been any other.

I cannot say but that it was in a great measure the fault of the churchmen that the church was so ill used, the Parliament in the first affair that came before it showing no disposition to annoy her.

This first affair was the repeal of the Corporation and Test Acts, which the Dissenters insisted on trying, notwithstanding Sir Robert Walpole had fairly told them, when they proposed it to him and asked his favour in it, whatever his private opinion might be, yet as all the clergy in England were so violently against it and looked upon this measure, or at least represented it, as so great an encroachment on the Established Church, he should be obliged, in the station he had the honour to serve the Crown, if the Dissenters persisted, contrary to his advice and entreaty, to try their strength on this question in Parliament, to oppose them.

From the Lord Chancellor, the Speaker of the House of Commons, and several other considerable people in Parliament whose favour the Dissenters went to solicit, they met with no better encouragement, notwithstanding
Mar — which they brought it into the House of Commons and lost it there.

There was at this time depending in the House of Commons a Bill brought in by Sir Joseph Jekyll to prevent the further alienation of lands by will in mortmain, and another for the more easy recovery of tithes from the people called Quakers.

All that the Quakers desired from this Bill was, not to be exempted from paying any tithes whatever paid by Church of England men, but as their silly consciences

would not permit them to pay tithes without being compelled to it, they prayed the Legislature to oblige the clergy to use those methods of compulsion that should be least expensive and oppressive to the Quakers, without making the property of the clergy in any point more insecure; which request was consonant to the scheme of a Bill formerly passed in their favour in the reign of King William. 1736

If anybody has a mind to see the state of the case more in detail, they may find it in two very short smart pamphlets that at this time made a good deal of noise; the one written against the Quakers by Sherlock, Bishop of Salisbury, and entitled "The Country Parson's Plea"; the other for the Quakers, entitled "The Quaker's Reply to the Country Parson's Plea," and written by Lord Hervey.

Gibson, Bishop of London, when first this Bill was brought into the House of Commons, went to Sir Robert Walpole and remonstrated against it; but Sir Robert plainly told him, though he had resolved to stretch his conscience in the case of the Dissenters and Test Act to oblige him, and was ready to do anything to support the Established Church, or, as far as he could justify it, to show favour to churchmen, yet the request of the Quakers was such as would list all mankind on their side, and irritate all mankind against the clergy if it was refused, for which reason he must be for it.

The Bishop of London, who could never brook the least contradiction, was much dissatisfied with this answer; but the repeal of the Test Act being yet under consideration and to come on first, he determined to postpone his further remonstrances against the Quaker-scheme till the other was over.

The morning after the proposal for the repeal of the Corporation and Test Acts was rejected in the House of Commons, the Bishop of London came to Sir Robert Walpole to thank him in the name of all the Bishops for the part he had acted in this point, and for all the declarations

1736 he had taken occasion upon this subject to make the day before in favour of the Established Church, and of his steady resolution to maintain at all times, as far as in him lay, the rights and property of the clergy. The Bishop of London in this interview said not one word of the Quakers, but went directly out of Sir Robert Walpole's house to the Archbishop of York's, who lived next door but one or two to Sir Robert's, and there, all the Bishops having been summoned to concert what was to be done to defeat the Mortmain and Quakers' Bills then depending, it was resolved that the Bishops should all send circular letters through their respective dioceses, to alarm the clergy, to notify to them what was going on in Parliament, to advise them to petition the Parliament, and to tell them, as the Bishops had thought it their duty to give them this warning and this advice, so they would provide counsel ready to support the petitions of the clergy in Parliament.

Butts, the Bishop of Norwich, who was at this meeting, came directly from thence to Lord Hervey's lodgings and gave him an account of everything that had passed there, telling him at the same time how much he disapproved what had been done, and how much he had been embarrassed between his disapprobation of the behaviour of his brethren, and his not caring to be the single man of the fraternity who would not go with the herd.

This Butts was a man of excellent good natural parts, whom Lord Hervey had taken out of the obscurity of a country living and a domestic chaplainship to his father, the Earl of Bristol, and had by his interest (since he was Vice-Chamberlain) first made him Dean of Norwich, and three years after Bishop; which obligation Bishop Butts always remembered with so warm and grateful a heart, that it was impossible for any man to be more thoroughly attached to the interest of another than he was to Lord Hervey, not satisfying himself with losing no opportunities that offered, but for ever seeking occasion to do him any pleasure or any service.

The Bishop of London, from his general principle of 1736 combating all lay recommendations, and making his favour and protection the only canal to church preferments, had not willingly submitted to Butt's first promotion to the Deanery of Norwich, but had so strenuously opposed his next step to the Bishopric, that he had made both the Bishop of Norwich and Lord Hervey at least as much his enemies as he had shown himself theirs.

Lord Hervey, however, on this occasion of the Quakers, told the Bishop of Norwich he was too young upon the bench to separate single from the rest of his fraternity, and advised him, whatever they did, to do the same. He then went to Sir Robert Walpole and told him what had passed. Sir Robert Walpole was equally surprised and angry at this conduct. The Court, too, resented this behaviour of the Bishops, and blamed them extremely, asking what they meant by trying to revive the long deadened spirit of church quarrels in the nation, and, by sounding these false alarms among the clergy of injury designed them, to put the whole kingdom in a ferment.

The Bishops, at first thinking themselves so considerable, and the body of the clergy so formidable, from the compliment that had been paid them in the case of the proposition for the repeal of the Corporation and Test Acts, justified in general what had been done, and the Bishop of London, to soften a little his particular conduct, sheltered himself under the old excuse of being obliged to swim with the stream of the clergy if the Court expected he should have any influence over them; but this was only the sequel of that part he had acted in Rundle's case, he himself having been the exciter of that spirit in the clergy which he affected to the Court only to comply with. In the main article (which was that of writing the circular letter) it was proved upon him, for though he said he had only done like all the rest of the Bishops, by whom it was agreed, at their meeting at the Archbishop of York's, that every one of them should write such a letter, yet Lord

1736 Hervey detected him in this flat lie to Sir Robert Walpole, having got into his hands an original letter of the Bishop of London's to one of his clergy of a date three days prior to the meeting at the Archbishop's, and conceived almost word for word in the same terms with the copy there agreed to; which showed that the general letter was of his concerting, and that to act the first rôle on this occasion he had anticipated with his own clergy the compliment which the other Bishops paid in a lump.

He wrote a long letter one Friday night to Sir Robert Walpole, which Sir Robert, going as usual the next morning to Richmond Park to pass his Saturday and Sunday with Miss Skerrit, resolved to answer there. This letter was full of so much insolence and pride and conceived in such impertinent terms to Sir Robert, considering his station, as well as such ungrateful expressions, considering the steady and friendly part Sir Robert had acted to this man, that Sir Robert owned he wrote the answer to it with less temper than he ever showed on any occasion.

Sir Robert Walpole said when he read the Bishop's letter again he thought he had said too little in answer to it; when he read his own he thought it too much; and having two days to cool, and thinking it below him to enter into an epistolary paper war with this ecclesiastical bully, he threw his own letter into the fire and made no answer to the Bishop at all.

But as he had always disliked Bishop Sherlock, and was afraid he might make some advantage at Court of this stumble of the Bishop of London's, Sir Robert represented the conduct of all the Bishops there, and particularly to the Queen, as equally culpable; adding, that Sherlock's part was as little to be justified in point of understanding and policy, as in integrity and gratitude; since he had not only partaken of all the Bishop of London's guilt in endeavouring to disturb the quiet of the kingdom, but by being only his follower had shown himself his dupe too.

The Queen, when Bishop Sherlock came to her, chid him 1736
extremely, and asked him if he was not ashamed to be overreached in this manner a second time by the Bishop of London; and after all she had said to him to point out his folly in following the Bishop of London in Rundle's affair, how he could be blind and weak enough to be running his nose into another's dirt again.

The King, with his usual softness in speaking of any people he disliked, called the Bishops, whenever he mentioned them in private on this occasion, a parcel of black, canting, hypocritical rascals; and said the Government was likely to go on well if those scoundrels were to dictate to their Prince how far he should or should not comply with the disposition of his Parliament; and to be giving themselves these impertinent airs in opposing everything that did not exactly suit with their silly opinions. And indeed church-power was so little relished at this time, and churchmen so little popular, that these cabals and combinations of the Bishops to oppose and influence the transactions of Parliament and to irritate the passions of the inferior clergy were generally exclaimed against and condemned.

The Mortmain Bill and the Quakers' Bill were both passed in the House of Commons by great majorities, and everybody that spoke for them gave the Bishops and the parsons very hard as well as very popular slaps. The young men all ran riot on these topics and there were none to take the part of the poor Church but a few old Tories and the Jacobites. Sir Robert Walpole, however, who hated extremes and dreaded the consequences of all intemperance in Parliament whatever, though he voted for these bills, endeavoured to quell and soften the zeal of those who voted with him, and rather followed in every step that was taken in them than promoted it.

When they were brought into the House of Lords the Bishops had the mortification of having all the severe things said to their faces which they had before been

1736 sufficiently mortified in barely hearing had been said. The
April 20 Duke of Argyll abused them the most and particularly the Bishop of London; but, considering his Grace's trade and theirs, most people thought he went too far, and that how hard soever he might be allowed to press them in facts, yet in words a soldier to a clergyman ought to have been more gentle.

My Lord Chief Justice Hardwicke struck deeper, as he expressly said that there were many things in two books written by the Bishop of London, or by his order, contrary to law, and that in those books powers were asserted to be in the Church which did not belong to it. He spoke also of pluralities as a great grievance and said he hoped the Legislature would take cognizance of this abuse in the Church and put some stop to it.

Lord Hervey laid open all the mismanagements in the fund called Queen Anne's Bounty, which was given for the augmentation of small livings and, by the disposition made of it, had never been properly applied according to the intention of Parliament, or with common justice to the poor clergy. He made this out so clearly to the House, by the calculations he had made of what this Corporation had received, and showing how those receipts had been disposed of, that in consequence of these representations the House of Lords addressed the Crown to inquire into this affair and to give the Corporation new rules and restrictions for their future proceedings; which, in consequence of this address, next summer was done in Council.

This inquiry into the management of Queen Anne's Bounty came à propos by the Bishops proposing this Corporation to be excepted in the Mortmain Bill, as the two Universities were. But the Mortmain Bill passed the House of Lords without this exception.

May 12 When the Quakers' Bill was debated it was lost by the two law Lords, the Lord Chancellor Talbot and the Lord Chief Justice Hardwicke, opposing it. One reason these law Lords had for this conduct was desiring to make their

peace with the clergy and regain some of that favour they 1736
had forfeited by their manner of espousing and pushing
the Mortmain Bill. But, in truth, the reason that weighed
most with them was the consideration of popularity with
the men of their own profession; for as great men as these
two lawyers were, and as upright as they were esteemed,
they had the spirit of preferring the power and profit of
their own profession as much at heart as any parson in the
kingdom, or any set of men in the world. It was this spirit
that made them and all the lawyers in both Houses for
the Mortmain Bill, as the fewer lands there were unalien-
able in the kingdom, the more titles to lands there would
be open to be litigated. It was this spirit, too, that made
them against the Quakers' Bill; for, as the purport of this
bill was to make a justice of peace a sort of referee between
the parson and the Quaker, in the case of all tithes under
ten pounds, so this bill, had it passed into a law, would,
of course, have prevented nine lawsuits in ten that were
now brought into Westminster Hall from ever coming
there. This Lord Hardwicke, in one of his speeches, with
great inadvertence (and I dare swear thorough repentance)
plainly avowed was his chief motive for opposing this bill;
saying, that "if the bill should pass, it would not only
exclude the jurisdiction of the Ecclesiastical Courts from
operating in the case of these tithes, but would also vir-
tually shut out the temporal courts, as it would make a
justice of the peace a turnpike to the temporal courts,
where almost all the disputants would be stopped." The
very reason (begging my Lord Hardwicke's pardon) that
should have induced every man in England, but a lawyer
or a parson, to be for this bill. But as long as money and
power are reckoned of the good things of this world, it
was no wonder the parsons should oppose a bill that would
abridge their present capacity of worrying a Quaker, or
that the lawyers should join the parsons when they were
to reap the profits from this equitable Christian chase.

From what I have said, it is pretty plain, in my opinion

1736 at least, that the lawyers, in promoting the Mortmain Bill or opposing the Quakers', had nothing strongly in view but the enriching the harvest of Westminster Hall, and that their popularity with the laity in the first, or with the clergy in the latter, was not their primary or chief consideration, but a casual incidental consequence of their attachment to the interests of their own burdensome profession.

Considering the manner in which the Bishops and clergy were treated during the dependence of this Quakers' Bill, they had no great reason to triumph in its being dropped, for the churchmen had never so strong reason to believe the decay of their interest in the kingdom as this winter. There was nobody of any rank or figure at present that could stand the ridicule of putting themselves at the head of a Church party. Lord Winchilsea, Lord Chesterfield, and Lord Bathurst had all spoken for the Quakers' Bill, and Lord Carteret had declared in his speech, that as much an enemy as everybody knew he was to this Administration, he would never join in attacking any minister ecclesiastically insulted.

Even the old Tories and Jacobites who had voted with the Bishops on this occasion had done it in a manner little more agreeable to their spiritual lordships than those who had voted against them; for there was not one of those who spoke in the debate that did not rather more than intimate that he had paid the Bishops this compliment from a regard to their vocation, and not to their personal characters; and that they did not reverence them more as members of the Church than they contemned them as tools to a court.

The King, about a month before the session concluded, had begun to break the ice in hinting his intention to go again this year to Hanover; and as Madame Walmoden's being with child before he left Hanover had extremely increased his fondness for her before they parted, so the birth of a son this spring had very much whetted

his impatience to return to her. A child, in most correspondences of this kind, is a cement that binds them faster, and the silly vanity old men have in getting one was an additional circumstance that made the King's fondness for Madame Walmoden increase much more on this incident than it would have done from the same cause twenty years ago. This being His Majesty's present situation, as the Church debates in Parliament had a little protracted the session beyond what was expected and, of course, postponed His Majesty's departure, he grew so inordinately peevish that everybody about him wished him gone almost as much as he wished to leave them. 1736

It was generally reported, and as generally believed, that he one day said to the Queen on this subject, in one of his fretful transports, when she was talking of what had passed in the House, and that the Bishops should not be suffered by the Court to be so irritated by the present run against them as to be made desperate and irreconcilable, that he did not care a farthing how it ended, provided it did but end some way or other; and, upon her attempting to reply, that he stopped her short, by saying: "I am sick to death of all this foolish stuff, and wish with all my heart that the devil may take all your Bishops, and the devil take your minister, and the devil take the Parliament, and the devil take the whole island, provided I can get out of it and go to Hanover." But the truth of this speech I cannot pretend to authenticate.

Towards the close of the session the Bishops, finding their interest and credit, both in and out of Parliament, much weaker than they could have imagined it, were glad to make overtures of peace with the Court; and the Court, knowing twenty-six votes in the House of Lords were always worth managing and preserving, was as ready to accept these offers of reconciliation as the Bishops were to make them. Mutual complaints passed and mutual forgiveness. The Bishops complained of the Church being attacked in the Quakers' Bill, and the Court of the

1736 Government being insulted in the manner the Bishops had taken to oppose it, and that cabals and combinations of that kind ought no more to be suffered by any Government among any set of men than it would be suffered in an army. All the Bishops who had access to the Queen complained, too, that their punishment had been much too great for their crime, and that, considering the firmness with which the whole Bench had stuck for so many years to the support of the Court, it was very hard, for one false step, and what at worst could only be called an excess of zeal on a commendable foundation, they should have been so treated, and not only abandoned by the Court to run the gauntlet unprotected through the House of Lords every day for two months together, but condemned to receive the severest lashes from Lords who were known to be in the greatest credit at Court. Sherlock and Hare talked to the Queen in this strain every time they saw her; to which the Queen answered that they both knew very well that the Duke of Argyll was not the most manageable man in the world, that his Presbyterian education had given him a spleen to all episcopacy, and that old squabbles with the Bishop of London had, joined to that general prejudice, made him take this occasion to gratify both. Sherlock said that, supposing that to be the Duke of Argyll's case, everybody knew it was not Lord Hervey's, and that everybody knowing he was with the Queen every day of his life in private, it was very natural to conclude that what he did every day of his life in public was not very disagreeable to her. The Queen said she had heard Lord Hervey had been very cool and very decent, and had not said one personal thing. Sherlock said all that was very true, but that it was true too that Lord Hervey had stirred and opened the whole affair relating to Queen Anne's Bounty; and that the air of coolness he put on when he was pretending to demonstrate that the Bishops were robbing the public under pretence of stealing for the poor clergy, and then cheating the poor clergy by giving

what they had stolen among the rich, was only in order 1736 to make people believe he spoke not from any motive of passion, but from a desire to do justice; and whilst others had only spoke to the passions of the laity against the Bishops, that Lord Hervey had endeavoured to set all the inferior clergy against them.

The Queen said she really knew nothing of the state of Queen Anne's Bounty, or the management of it; but if it was wrong, as the Bishop of London was known to have had the chief hand in it, she did not wonder, "nor you (said she), my Lord, cannot wonder, at what Lord Hervey has done. You know he has hated the Bishop of London ever since he opposed Butts being Bishop of Norwich; and since that Lord Hervey says, in several little things he has desired of Sir Robert Walpole in Church matters, the Bishop of London has always opposed him; and though I do not justify Lord Hervey for laying open at this time the frauds that have been committed in this thing, and making all the Bishops odious, because he feels a resentment against one of them, yet I can easier excuse him for throwing some of the Bishop of London's dirt upon you than I can excuse all you other fools, who love the Bishop of London no better than he does, for taking the Bishop of London's dirt upon yourselves. You know I love you (continued the Queen to Sherlock), and that I wish you well, and therefore I have a right to chide you that you will not let me do you the good I have a mind to do you; but with all your good sense, how was it possible you could be so blind and so silly to be running a race of popularity with the Bishop of London among the clergy, and hope you could rise upon the Bishop of London's ruins, whom you hate and wish ruined, when you were going hand-in-hand with him in these very paths which you hoped would ruin him, and by these means brought yourself to be just in such a situation that, if the Bishop of London could force the Court into his measures, you had lent your force to

1736 strengthen your enemy, and, if he fell, you must fall with him? Are you not ashamed not to have seen this, and to have been at once in this whole matter the Bishop of London's assistant and enemy, tool and dupe?" If Sherlock made any good answer to this, all I can say is, I know it not; and as I heard the conversation reported only by the Queen, it is no wonder I should know no good answer if a good one had or could have been given, few people who speak so well caring to own they have been as well answered. But in this case there was so much truth in what the Queen had alleged that I do not really see there was a good answer to be made. Sir Robert, to prevent Sherlock's making any advantage of the Bishop of London's disgrace, had inculcated all this and poured it so often into the Queen's ears that I dare say by the manner in which she repeated it to me, it came very glibly out of her mouth.

When Bishop Hare complained to the Queen of Lord Hervey's conduct in Parliament he said Lord Hervey was not contented with displaying his own fine oratory against the Bishops, but that he must breed up his ape, my Lord Hinton, to abuse them too, and write speeches for him, full of all these impertinences which he was ashamed to speak himself. The Queen was extremely diverted with the Bishop's eagerness, and particularly with the expression of the ape; and the next morning told Lord Hervey every word that had passed. Lord Hervey desired the Queen to tell the Bishop that he liked his own young ape much better than he did her old baboon; and added that, if he could keep this story no better than Her Majesty and was to tell it Lord Hinton, his ape would certainly knock her baboon down the first time he met him.

The next time the Queen saw Bishop Hare she confessed to him that she had not been able to resist telling Lord Hervey about the ape; upon which the Bishop cried out in a most abominable fright, "Good God, Madam, what have you done? You have made these two men my

enemies for ever. As for my Lord Hervey, he will satisfy 1736 himself perhaps with playing his wit off upon me and calling me Old Baboon; but for my Lord Hinton, who has no wit, he will knock me down." This tallied so ridiculously with what Lord Hervey had said to the Queen, that she burst into a fit of laughter which lasted some minutes before she could speak; and then she told the Bishop: "That is just, my good Lord, what Lord Hervey did do, and what he said the ape would do." But afterwards she bid the Bishop be under no apprehensions of this matter going any further, for that she would answer for Lord Hervey's not repeating what she had said to him.

All the Bishops, except the Bishops of Salisbury and London, made their peace again so well with the Court that they stood much on the same foot after the conclusion of the session as they had done before it began, the Court satisfying itself with its having been proved to the Bishops of how little consideration they were without the support of the Court, and the Bishops glad, after nobody would receive them, to return again to those who, though offended, were ready to absolve them.

Bishop Sherlock was seemingly as much restored as the rest, but not in reality and essentials, for as the Bishop of London was now no longer designed to succeed the Archbishop of Canterbury when his Grace, who had been long mellow, should at last drop, so Sherlock had lost the hope of succeeding Gibson on that promotion at London, and saw too plainly, deprived of the long-expected fruits of that promise, that Sir Robert's opposition to him with the new handle given would be too strong to let him in at Canterbury. And indeed Sir Robert had taken such effectual care with the Queen to prevent this, that he had told Her Majesty the spirit of people in general, and particularly of the House of Commons, was so strong against Sherlock, as a man thought both willing and able to carry Church power as high as ever it was known in this nation, that if she thought of sending him

1736 to Canterbury at this time she must call a new Parliament, for that he had seen enough of this, this session, to know that nobody would be able to manage it, alarmed by such a preferment to the head of the Church.

The Queen therefore advised Sherlock to go down to his diocese and live quietly, to let the spirit he had raised so foolishly against him here subside, and to reproach himself only if he had failed or should fail of what he wished should be done and she had wished to do for him.

It will be very natural for everybody to wonder how a man who loved power so well as the Bishop of London, and was never reckoned a fool, could wantonly throw it away in the manner he has done.

The Bishop of London was a man of so haughty, so insolent, and so sour a disposition, as no man was ever more ungrateful to his superiors and benefactors, more assuming among his equals, or more oppressive towards his inferiors, that it was very easy to reconcile his conduct to his character in the point of pride, but very difficult for anybody to account for it conformable to the opinion the world had always entertained of his understanding.

As Sir Robert Walpole was every way best able to explain the riddle, I shall solve it in his words.

The Bishop of London hated Sherlock, and had always insisted with the Court, when he himself should be removed to Canterbury, upon naming his successor at London; telling Sir Robert Walpole that if he went to Lambeth, and Sherlock was settled at London, that he knew very well the consequence would be Sherlock's having all the power, and that all he should get for playing it into his hands would be the honour of being called "your Grace," and living in the palace at Lambeth; and he told Sir Robert Walpole that from Lambeth he should never be able to see him but by appointment, whereas from the house he now had in Whitehall he could watch opportunities, and see him at any time in five minutes; and for these reasons, unless he had the power of putting

somebody he could entirely depend upon into his present 1736
bishopric, that he was determined not to leave it. Sir
Robert Walpole said: "My Lord, you know I have always
made it a point to maintain you in spite of all your enemies,
and the attacks that have been made upon me to shake
your interest. I will continue to do so, and declare, at
London or Lambeth, wherever you are, you shall be my
first and sole minister for Church matters; and as I will
never deceive you by doing less than I promise, so I
will give you no hopes of my doing more than I know I
can. I can make you Archbishop; I can keep all the power
in your hands when you are Archbishop; but I cannot
prevent Sherlock's succeeding you at London; his interest
with the Queen on this point is too strong for me in
prudence to undertake to combat it. For those Ministers
who are resolved always to go as far as they think they can
go, may sometimes go much further than they should go;
and, in my opinion, knowing when to yield is as great a
skill as any that belongs to courts."

The Bishop of London took this ill, imagining either
that Sir Robert ought to have risked everything rather
than suffered Sherlock to come in at London, or that Sir
Robert was inclined to divide the power between them.
Sir Robert says he believes from this interview the Bishop
of London took the resolution of not going on these terms
to Canterbury, and either hoped he should prove himself
considerable enough to force the Court into his measures
and to comply with his own terms, or at least, if he could
not, that by pushing his opposition to the Court in Church
matters he should so far ingratiate himself with the clergy,
and hide the true state of this rupture, as to have them and
all the world imagine that it was produced on ecclesiastical
points and not on personal jealousy.

It is very certain that the Bishop of London's public
style of talking at this time so far authenticated this
manner of accounting for the reason of his strange
behaviour that in all his conversations, as well as all his

1736 letters, the purport of his assertions was that there was at present, both in and out of Parliament, an anti-Church spirit every day growing stronger and stronger which Sir Robert Walpole either could not or would not quell, and that it was equal to him whether it was Sir Robert's negligence or impotence that suffered it to rage; that, for his own part, the Church on one side, and the Court on the other, had been so long grinding him between them, that he was determined now to get out of that uneasy situation; and, since he found there was no serving God and Mammon, he should not long hesitate in making the option, but was determined to adhere, without the least swerving, to his God, his Church, his religion, his charge, his profession, his duty, and his fraternity.

Sir Robert Walpole told Lord Hervey nobody wished at present more for the Archbishop's life than he did, for, should his Grace die just now, he should not know how to replace him. Lord Hervey said he could not imagine why he should be so much embarrassed. "Sure, Sir," continued he, "you have had enough of great geniuses. Why can you not take some Greek and Hebrew block-head, that has learning enough to justify the preferment, and not sense enough to make you repent of it? During the Bishop of London's reign your situation was much worse than doing nothing in Church matters; for the demerit towards everybody that was disoblged was thrown upon your account, and the merit of every obligation that was conferred the Bishop of London placed to his own. Add to this that all the laity were angry with you for supporting a man so obnoxious to them, whilst none of the clergy thought they owed any thanks for what they got to anybody but him. This I hope, Sir, for the future will cure you of having another Pope, and teach you to take the management and dispensation of ecclesiastical as well as temporal favours and preferments into your own hands, that you may not be blamed for other people's faults, nor let other people be thanked for your merits."

Sir Robert said all this was very true, but that Sherlock's interest with the Queen stood upon such a foot, that it would be very difficult to find any Bishop to trip up his heels there. Lord Hervey replied: "You, Sir, have shaken her opinion of Sherlock's understanding in practice so much lately, and laid so strong a foundation for another to stand upon, by telling Her Majesty that she cannot carry Sherlock to Lambeth at present without calling a new Parliament, that I fancy I could name a man who, with these helps, and the natural inclination the Queen has always shown to him, might at this time get the preference to Sherlock in this promotion. The man I mean is Potter, the Bishop of Oxford; and the same power that hindered him from getting the better of Hoadly in the last preferment to the Bishopric of Winchester might easily, I believe, help him to get the better of Sherlock in case of a vacancy at Canterbury. Potter is a man of undoubted great learning, of as little doubted probity. He has been always, though reckoned a Tory in the Church, uninterruptedly attached to this family, without the lure or reward of any preferment but this poor Bishopric of Oxford, where he has stuck for twenty years. The Queen loves him; his character will support you in sending him to Lambeth; and his capacity is not so good, nor his temper so bad, as to make you apprehend any great danger in his being there."

Sir Robert agreed to all Lord Hervey had urged, but seemed much more inclined to take Hare, provided he could get the Queen to accept of him. Hare's having been his tutor at the University gave Sir Robert prejudices for him; and the good correspondence in which he had lived with him ever since made his vanity, I believe, more inclined to Hare than Potter, as the promotion in that case would be more marked out to have been made solely by his influence. Lord Hervey told him, "You will certainly repent of it if you take Hare. He is a haughty, hard-natured, imperious, hot-headed, injudicious fellow, who,

1736 I firmly believe, would give you more trouble at Lambeth than even Sherlock himself, and, besides that, is so thoroughly disliked in private and feared in public life that I do not think you could lodge power in more unpopular hands." This did not weaken Sir Robert's bias towards him, but Lord Hervey's constantly talking to the Queen in this strain strengthened the natural bias she had against him, and his Lordship never lost any opportunity of doing Potter as many good offices as he did ill ones to Hare; and, as all he said on these two subjects had the groundwork of her own inclination, it made an impression which, without that aid, would have sunk much less deep, and been much easier effaced. Thus stood the situation of Church matters.

I must now go a little back to give an account of the Prince's marriage, which was another principal event of this winter. It had been so long talked of without anything being done to forward it, that everybody began to think it was not designed, when a step was taken that showed at last the King was in earnest. This step was His Majesty's Feb. 4 sending a message in form to the Prince by five of the Cabinet Council—Lord Chancellor Talbot, Lord Wilmington, President of the Council; Lord Godolphin, Privy Seal; Duke of Grafton, Chamberlain; and Duke of Devonshire, Steward—to acquaint the Prince that His Majesty, if His Royal Highness liked it, would demand the Princess of Saxe-Gotha for him in marriage. The Prince made answer with great decency, duty, and propriety, that whoever His Majesty thought a proper match for his son would be agreeable to him.

In consequence of this message to the Prince, Lord Delaware, Treasurer of the King's Household, was nominated for the embassy to Saxe-Gotha to demand the Princess of her brother the Duke in marriage for the Prince of Wales. Lord Delaware, if the King chose him to prevent the Prince's having any jealousy of his future bride's affections being purloined on the way by him who

was sent to attend her to England, was the properest man 1736
His Majesty could have pitched upon; for, except his white staff and red riband, as Knight of the Bath, I know of nothing belonging to the long, lank, awkward person of Lord Delaware that could attract her eyes; nor do I believe there could be found in any of the Goth or Vandal courts of Germany a more unpolished ambassador for such an occasion.

The necessary preparations for this embassy taking up some little time, the King, being very impatient to return to Hanover to the arms of Madame Walmoden, declared to his Queen and his Ministers, that if matters could not be so managed as to bring the Princess of Saxe-Gotha into England before the expiration of the month of April the marriage should either be put off till the winter or solemnized without him, for that he would positively set out for Germany as soon as ever the Parliament was up.

This declaration obliged the Ministers to hurry on this affair, and on Sunday morning, the 25th of April, whilst the King was at chapel, news was brought him that the Princess of Saxe-Gotha was landed at Greenwich. On the Tuesday following, about two o'clock, she came to St. James's; and, the marriage being to be performed that evening, the whole Court, and almost indeed the whole town, resorted to St. James's in their wedding-clothes to see her arrival.

She came from Greenwich in one of the King's coaches to Lambeth, was conveyed from thence to Whitehall in one of his barges, and from Whitehall came through St. James's Park and Garden in the King's chair to the foot of the steps that go out of the King's apartment into the garden, where the Prince, who had been often at Greenwich in these two days, received her and led her up to the King, who had been waiting (not very patiently) above an hour with the Queen and the whole Court in the great drawing-room to receive her. As soon as she came she threw herself all along on the floor first at the King's

1736 and then at the Queen's feet, who both took her up and embraced her. This prostration was known to be so acceptable an accosting to His Majesty's pride that, joined to the propriety of her whole behaviour on this occasion, it gave the spectators great prejudices in favour of her understanding, which on better acquaintance afterwards soon mouldered away.

This Princess was but seventeen years old when she came to England, knew not a mortal here, and was suffered to bring nobody but one single man with her, so that in this situation, and brought from the solitude of her mother's country-house in Saxe-Gotha at once into the crowd, intrigues, and pomp of this Court, the bare negative good conduct of doing nothing absurd might reasonably prejudice sensible people in her favour. Sir Robert Walpole was one of this number, who said to me the morning after the wedding that her gaining upon the King last year in one interview enough to make him fond of the match and her behaving at Greenwich to the Prince in such a manner as to put him in good-humour with it, after all His Royal Highness had uttered against her before he had seen her, were circumstances that spoke strongly in favour of brains that had had but seventeen years to ripen.

She could speak not one word of English, and few of French; and when it was proposed the year before to her mother, when this match was resolved upon, that she should be taught one of these languages, her mother said it must be quite unnecessary, for the Hanover Family having been above twenty years on the throne, to be sure most people in England spoke German (and especially at Court) as often and as well as English. A conjecture so well founded that I believe there were not three natives in England that understood one word of it better than in the reign of Queen Anne.

The Princess was rather tall, and had health and youth enough in her face, joined to a very modest and good-natured look, to make her countenance not disagreeable;

but her person, from being very ill-made, a good deal awry, 1736
her arms long, and her motions awkward, had, in spite of
all the finery of jewels and brocade, an ordinary air,
which no trappings could cover or exalt.

She did not appear at all embarrassed on this occasion,
which most people gave as an instance of sense; but Lady
Stafford, an old French lady, daughter of the famous
Count de Gramont, who had a pension from this Court,
and had lived for many years in England, and had as much
wit, humour, and entertainment in her as any man or
woman I ever knew, with a great justness in her way of
thinking, and very little reserve in her manner of giving
her opinion of things and people, said: "Pour moi,
je trouve qu'on juge très mal car si cette pauvre Princesse
avait le sens commun, elle doit être embarrassé dans sa
situation; quand on a un tel rôle à jouer, qu'on doit
épouser un sot Prince et vivre avec un désagréable animal
toute sa vie, on doit sentir ses malheurs, et je suis sûre
qu'elle est sotte, et même très sotte, puis qu'elle n'est pas
embarrassée et qu'elle ne paraît point confondue dans
toutes les nouveautés parmi lesquelles elle se trouve."

The King and Queen dined this day as usual in their
own apartment, but the Duke and the Princesses were
ordered to dine with the Prince and his bride in the
Prince's apartment, where the King, to avoid all difficulties
about ceremony, had ordered them to go undressed.
Notwithstanding which the Prince wisely contrived to
raise a thousand disputes, pretending first that his brother
and sisters should sit upon stools whilst he and his bride
sat in armed chairs at the head of the table; next, that they
should not be served on the knee, though neither of these
things had ever entered before into his head since he came
into England, and that he had ate with them constantly
every day.

However, in both these things and several others, the
Princesses having had their directions from the King and
Queen what they were to do, His Royal Highness was

1736 overruled; the Princesses would not go into his eating-room, but stayed in his ante-chamber, till the stools were taken away and chairs carried in; and being to be served by their own servants at table, they ordered their servants to do everything for them, just as the Prince and Princess's did for them; only after dinner, the Princess Caroline told me, they were forced to go without their coffee, for fear that being poured out by a servant of the Princess's, they might have met with some disgrace had they accepted of any in the manner of giving it.

I mention these occurrences to show from what wise motives the irreconcilable differences in princely families often proceed, and by what important circumstances they are prudently and sensibly on both sides generally widened and kept up, and with what right people of their age and rank have either to reprehend or despise children in a nursery that are scratching and pinching one another for tops and shuttlecocks, when these purpled children are running the risk of losing the advantages they have over the rest of the world, by squabbling and contesting with one another for trifles of as little moment—for chairs, and stools, and the posture in which they are to receive a little wine and water.

At night about 9 o'clock the ceremony of the wedding was performed in much the same manner as that of the Princess Royal had been, only there was no gallery built. Consequently there could be no procession in form, and they were married in that Chapel to which the King constantly goes on a Sunday.

At supper nothing remarkable happened but the Prince's eating several glasses of jelly, and every time he took one turning about, laughing, and winking on some of his servants.

The King went after supper to the Princess's apartment whilst the Queen undressed the Princess, and when they were in bed everybody passed through their bed-chamber to see them, where there was nothing remarkable

but the Prince's nightcap, which was some inches higher 1736 than any grenadier's cap in the whole army.

There were various reports on what did and did not pass this night after the company was retired. The Queen and Lord Hervey agreed that the bride looked extremely tired with the fatigues of the day, and so well refreshed next morning, that they concluded she had slept very sound; and Her Majesty did not forget to descant at the same time with her usual enjoyment on the glasses of jelly and the nightcap, saying the one made her sick, and the other, if it had not been her son, would have made her laugh.

The two Houses of Parliament addressed the King on this occasion, and in the House of Commons three very April 29 remarkable speeches were made by Mr. Grenville and Mr. Lyttelton, two of Lord Cobham's nephews, and Cornet Pitt, who got up one after another in the House of Commons to compliment the Prince's character and the Princess's family and to insinuate, not in very covert terms, that the King had very little merit to the nation in making this match, since it had been owing to the Prince demanding it of his father, and the voice of the people calling for it too strongly not to be complied with.

At the end of the session Cornet Pitt was broke for this, which was a measure at least ill-timed, if not ill-taken; since the breaking him at the end of the session looked as if it had been done on account of the general tenor of his conduct during the session, to avoid which interpretation, if the Court did not think him too inconsiderable an object to be distinguished by such a mark of its resentment, he ought certainly to have been turned out the night after he made this speech, to mark out the crime that drew the King's indignation upon him.

Before the King went abroad he sent a message by the Duke of Grafton to the Prince to let him know that wherever the Queen resided there would always be apartments provided for him and the Princess. This message

1736 being verbal, when the Prince complained that it was to tell him he was to be prisoner wherever the Queen resided, that explanation of it was denied, and on the King's side of the house it was said that it was rather a civility shown to the Prince; though in reality everybody knew how it was meant, and the design was certainly to prevent either Prince or Princess having a separate court, and so afterwards explained.

I forgot to mention one thing in its proper place, which was the dispute between the Queen and the Prince, when she nominated the Princess's servants before her coming over, about Lady Archibald Hamilton's being one of the Ladies of the Bedchamber. The Prince insisted much upon it; but the Queen said whether she believed Lady Archibald innocent or not, the Prince's behaviour to her had been so particular, and had caused her to be so generally talked of as being his mistress, that it was impossible for her to put Lady Archibald about the Princess without incurring the censure of the whole world; and therefore all she could do to oblige him in this particular was, as the Princess was designed to have four Ladies, to nominate but three, leaving a vacancy in case the Princess liked to have Lady Archibald about her, to add her afterwards. But Mrs. Townshend, wife of his Groom of the Bedchamber, whom the Prince also solicited to have one of the Women of the Bedchamber, the King peremptorily refused, not on account of prudery, for the Prince was never talked of for Mrs. Townshend, but for political reasons, His Majesty bidding the Queen say to her son that as Mr. Townshend was the most impertinent puppy in the Prince's whole family, he was determined not to reward him for being so; and that it was more favour than either the servant or master deserved that he himself was not turned out.

Upon the Prince's marriage the King increased his allowance from £24,000 to £50,000 a year, which the Prince said was robbing him of £50,000 as the Parliament when

it gave the Civil List at the King's accession designed him 1736
£100,000, which the King had had in the former reign
when he was Prince of Wales; and most people were of
the same opinion.

The breach between these two parts of the family grew
wider every day, and this circumstance of the £100,000,
as it was one of the principal causes of their disagreement,
and indeed the most material point in dispute between
them, it was not likely the breach would ever be healed,
as the one would never cease to think the withholding half
of this income a wrong done to him, and the other would
never be prevailed upon, right or wrong, to give it.

Sir Robert Walpole told the Queen that he could see
no way of keeping the Prince within any tolerable bounds
but by the Princess; and yet, if Her Majesty tried to
cultivate any good correspondence there too early, he said
it would only give the Prince a jealousy, and prevent his
ever suffering his wife to have any interest with him or
any influence at all over his conduct; and therefore that
Her Majesty must give the Princess time to form an
interest in him before she went about to make any use of
Her Royal Highness to these purposes.

In the middle of May the King left England, and the
same morning he left St. James's to embark at Gravesend *May 22*
the Queen went to Richmond, taking with her her child-
ren, her Lady and Woman of the Bedchamber in Waiting,
and Lord Hervey. The Prince pretended that he designed
to follow her next day and stay at his house at Kew till the
Queen returned to Kensington to open her commission of
Regent, which she never used to do till the news was
brought of the King's being landed in Holland. But the
Princess being taken ill the night before they were to
remove to Kew, or being ordered to say she was so, the
Prince sent to let the Queen know he was prevented by
the indisposition of his wife from coming to Kew as he
had intended, and ordered all the things and servants
which had been sent thither to be brought back to London.

1736 The Prince first said the Princess had the measles, but as he could not get Dr. Hollings, who attended her, to confirm this report, he brought the measles down to a rash, and at last compounded for a great cold.

The Queen having a mind to be satisfied of the truth of the case, whilst she thought the Princess in perfect health, as she herself told me, pretended to believe her ill, and with great civility and maternal kindness went with her two eldest daughters to London to see her. But the Princess keeping her bed, and the room being made (on purpose, as the Queen imagined) very dark, she returned as little informed of the true state of her daughter-in-law's health as she went.

However, most people were of opinion this illness, if not entirely feigned, was much aggravated by the Prince's report of it, partly because he liked better to stay in town and divert himself there, but chiefly to take the first opportunity of evading, if not disobeying, the orders he had received from the King by the Duke of Grafton.

When the Queen went to Kensington to open her commission of Regent, His Royal Highness did not think fit to appear at Council, but contrived to come to Kensington just after the Council was over, and pretending he had designed to be present, though he was too late.

Lord Harrington's ■ state of health was made the pretence for Horace Walpole's being sent in his stead this year to Hanover with the King. But had his health been better, his interest at Court was so much worse that some other reason would have been found and given for his not going; for it was a resolution to my knowledge taken the year before by the Queen and Sir Robert, that Lord Harrington should never be suffered to go thither with the King again.

There were a great number of commissions in the army vacant, which the King, from a natural dilatoriness in his temper, joined to a particular backwardness in giving, had postponed filling up all the winter, notwithstanding the

frequent and pressing instances made to him by Sir Robert Walpole, who never received any other answer on these occasions from His Majesty, than "My God! It is time enough. I will fill them up at the end of the session." 1736

Most people thought the King's reason for keeping commissions in the army vacant in this manner was because the pay during their being vacant went into his pocket, and had that been the case his conduct would not have been so wonderful in this particular. But it was not his avarice that operated in this point, for he got little or nothing by it, the intermediate pay not coming to him, but being accounted for to the public. It was therefore owing merely to his reluctance to oblige, and his loving nobody well enough to have any pleasure in preferring them that this vast number of posts in the army was unfilled.

At the end of the session, when Sir Robert came with these numerous solicitations, the King said it was impossible for him in the hurry of his departure to answer them all; so signed only some few before he went, and a few more after he got to Hanover, which in the account of the last year's transactions at Hanover I think I observed was an illegal practice, the regal power being not divisible, and by delegation at this time vested in the Queen.

His Majesty's happiness with Madame Walmoden at Hanover did not last long without alloy or interruption, an unlucky accident happening, that gave occasion to His Majesty to fret, as much as it gave occasion to those who were less concerned in it to laugh.

The fact was this. Whilst the King was at Herrenhausen, and Madame Walmoden at her lodgings in the palace at Hanover, one night the gardener found a ladder, which did not belong to the garden, set up against Madame Walmoden's window; and concluding ■ was with a design to rob her, this poor, innocent, careful servant made diligent search in the garden, and found a man lurking behind an espalier, whom he concluded to be the thief;

1736 accordingly, by the assistance of his fellow-servants, he seized and carried him to the captain of the guard then upon duty. When the prisoner was brought to the light, it proved to be one Monsieur Schulenburg, a relation of the Duchess of Kendal's and an officer in the Imperial service. He complaining to the captain of the guard of this violence, and the captain of the guard, like the gardener, thinking nothing but a design of robbery could be at the bottom of this affair and that a man of that rank was certainly no robber, ordered him to be released.

This affair made a great noise immediately, and Madame Walmoden, thinking it would be for her advantage to tell the story herself first to the King, ordered her coach at six o'clock in the morning, drove to Herrenhausen, and went directly to the King's bedside, threw herself on her knees, drowned in tears, and begged of His Majesty either to protect her from being insulted or to give her leave to retire. She said she doted on him as her lover and her friend, and never when she gave him her heart considered him as a King; but that she found too late, that no woman could live with a King as with a man of inferior rank; but that a thousand people, for political reasons, and with whom she was too weak to struggle, were studying every day new tricks to ruin her; and therefore as she foresaw sooner or later she must be undone, though she preferred the King's love to every other pleasure or happiness in the world, yet as her cowardice made her prefer security and quiet even to that, she begged His Majesty would give her timorous innocence leave to retire out of a world and a Court she was unfit to live in.

The King, surprised at this unexpected visit and this long preface, asked what all this meant. She then told the story just as I have related it, and said she was sure this was a trick of the Schulenburg family, and perhaps a contrivance of Madame d'Elitz to ruin her.

This Madame d'Elitz was a Schulenburg, sister to my Lady Chesterfield, a very handsome lady, though now a

little in her decline, with a great deal of wit, who had had 1736
a thousand lovers, and had been caught in bed with a
man twenty years ago and been divorced from her husband
upon it. She was said to have been mistress to three genera-
tions of the Hanover family; the late King, the present, and
the Prince of Wales before he came to England, which was
one generation more than the Duchess of Valentinois,
who had been mistress to Henry II., could boast of in
France.

The present King had quitted Madame d'Elitz for
Madame Walmoden, upon which a quarrel ensued
between the two ladies, and the King thereupon had turned
Madame d'Elitz out of the palace the year before. Just,
therefore, when the King set out for Hanover this year,
Madame d'Elitz set out for England, where she now was
with her aunt and sister, the Duchess of Kendal and Lady
Chesterfield.

Madame Walmoden affected to the King to believe
that all this had happened the night before from a plot
laid by Madame d'Elitz and her family to be revenged of
her for the victory she had got over them in the King's
favour.

The King was extremely incensed, and ordered the
captain of the guard at Hanover to be put under arrest
immediately for having released Monsieur Schulenburg,
and Monsieur Schulenburg to be again apprehended.

Horace Walpole, fearing, as Monsieur Schulenburg was
in the Emperor's service, this simple love-affair might
grow an affair of State, and the Emperor resent the ill-
usage which the King's warmth at this time might offer
to this officer, went immediately to Count Kinski, the
Emperor's minister, and advised him, by all means, that
very hour to force Monsieur Schulenburg to leave Han-
over and get as fast as he could out of the Hanoverian
dominions, which advice was forthwith followed.

Some people in England thought, but I believe without
foundation, that Horace Walpole had a hand in this ladder

1736 affair, in order to ruin Madame Walmoden, and make his court to the Queen. Others said that Monsieur Schulenburg had an intrigue with Madame Walmoden's chamber-maid. Others, that the ladder belonged to the garden, and that one of the workmen had placed it where it was found by accident. What the truth was, I know not; but it had not the effect of weakening Madame Walmoden's interest in the King, who continued as fond of her as ever.

Horace Walpole wrote an account of this affair to Sir Robert, and the King to the Queen, from both which letters the account I have given is taken.

The King's letter was a very extraordinary one, asking the Queen, as he would have done a man-friend, what she thought of all this business; saying perhaps his passion for Madame Walmoden might make him see it in a partial light for her, and desiring the Queen to "*consulter le gros homme*" (meaning Sir Robert), "*qui a plus d'expérience, ma chère Caroline, que vous dans ces affaires, et moins de préjugé que moi dans celle-ci.*"

In the meantime, in England there happened several disturbances of a family and public nature, which I must not pass over in silence.

The Princess of Wales took it into her head to have some scruples about receiving the sacrament according to the manner of the Church of England, and went to the communion at a Lutheran German chapel.

The Queen, at the desire of Sir Robert Walpole, spoke to the Prince on this subject, and told him he ought to interpose, representing to him, when this thing came to take air, how ill it would be received not only by the bishops and clergy, but by the people of England in general, and what bad consequences it might have, by giving the whole nation prejudices against his wife.

The Prince assured the Queen he had already said everything he could think of on this subject to his wife to no purpose; that in answer, she only wept and talked of her conscience.

Lord Hervey advised the Queen at her next conference 1736 to tell the Prince that this might grow a very serious affair; for as the Act of Succession enjoined the heirs to the Crown, on no less a penalty than the forfeiture of the Crown, to receive the sacrament according to the manner of the Church of England as by law established, it was impossible to say how that law might be construed to extend to the wife of the Prince of Wales, and whether she might not possibly be sent back to Saxe-Gotha.

All these arguments and conferences had their effect at last so well that the Princess dried her tears, lulled her conscience, and went no more to the Lutheran Church, but received the sacrament like the rest of the royal family.

An old woman called Madame Rixeiven, who had been the Princess's governess at Saxe-Gotha and was sent for to England at her request, was thought to have put this conscientious nonsense into the Princess's head; but talking to her too freely also on conjugal points, the Prince soon grew to dislike her, and sent her back from whence she came.

There was another thing which happened soon after, relating to going to church; which, though an affair not of devotion and religion, but of pride and ceremonial, yet as it is of the number of royal trifles that had like to have been of serious consequence, I must insert.

The Prince and Princess, whether from an air of grandeur or by chance I know not, used generally to come to chapel at Kensington after the service had been some time begun; and the Princess, when she did so, being obliged to crowd by the Queen, and to pass before her, between the Queen and where her book lay, the Queen, who really found it troublesome, the passage being very narrow, and, besides the trouble, thinking it had not a very respectful or decent air, after suffering it two or three Sundays, sent and ordered Sir William Irby, the Princess's chamberlain (Her Majesty being already in the chapel), to bring the Princess in at another door where

1736 the Ladies of the Bedchamber came in, and through which the Princess might come to her place without crowding by the Queen if she was standing, or being obliged to stay at the door, if the Queen was kneeling, till Her Majesty rose up. But notwithstanding these orders the Prince, who was present when the Queen's Vice-Chamberlain delivered them to the Princess's, commanded Sir William Irby to carry the Princess into chapel at the same door he used to do, and accordingly he did so.

The Queen, as it is natural to believe, did not much approve of this disobedience to her orders; and, speaking of it the next morning to Lord Hervey, said she believed nobody was ever treated so impertinently as to be told one should not be mistress in one's own house, nor be able to order what door should or should not be opened.

Lord Hervey said she was certainly in the right; but that it was very plain by this, and many other particulars in the Prince's conduct since the King went, that he endeavoured to force her to quarrel with him during his father's absence, that he might have it to say that the one was as hard to be lived with as the other; for which reason, if he were to advise Her Majesty, he would wish, if the Prince was to sit down in her lap, that she would only say she hoped he found it easy. He added that if she ordered her servants to stand at the chapel-door where she went in, and not suffer it to be opened after she was once seated, to be sure she might keep the Princess from coming in and make Her Royal Highness go round to the other door or back again to her own apartment. But then it would make an éclat, and the Prince would carry a point he had more at heart than the door, which was that of a public dispute.

After this, the Prince, being told, I believe, by some of his own people that he was in the wrong, ordered the Princess, whenever she was not ready to go into chapel with the Queen, not to go at all, and by this means avoided either persisting or yielding.

The Prince had contrived to put Lady Archibald Hamilton so well into the Princess's good graces that she was her first favourite, and always with her; and to obviate any alarms that might be given to her jealousy, he told the Princess himself that malicious people had set it about that she was his mistress; and that the Queen, who was glad of any pretence to cross him, had laid hold of this excuse to refuse making her one of the ladies of the Princess's Bedchamber, though he had pressed it extremely; and that the Queen had owned she never believed there was the least foundation for any such report. At the same time he extolled Lady Archibald's merit and virtue, and said, though she was married very young to an old man, and had been very pretty, that not the least blemish had ever been thrown upon her character till some of the King and Queen's Court, to vex him and to please them, who grudge him the friendship of every man and woman that ever attached themselves to him, made this malicious insinuation.

This had its effect so well that the Princess made it her request to the Queen that she would write to Hanover to the King, to ask his leave for her to take Lady Archibald Hamilton into her service; to which the King consenting, Lady Archibald was immediately made Lady of the Bedchamber, Privy Purse, and Mistress of the Robes to the Princess, with a salary, for all three together, of nine hundred pounds a year.

It would be endless if I were to tell how many hints the Prince gave of the Princess being with child this summer; but one foolish circumstance in Her Royal Highness's manner of passing her time I must relate, which was her playing every day with a great jointed baby, and dressing and undressing it two or three times every day. Princess Caroline, who had heard that the sentinels and footmen used to stand and stare and laugh during this performance, desired her sister-in-law one day not to stand at her window during these operations on her

1736 baby; for though there was nothing ridiculous in the thing itself, yet, the lower sort of people thinking everything so that was not customary, it would draw a mob about her and make *la canaille* talk disagreeably.

Notwithstanding the little *démêlés* that happened between the Queen and the Prince, Her Majesty, being determined not to quarrel with him during the King's absence, never failed asking him and the Princess to dine with her (which they often did during the summer) whenever they came in the morning to her drawing-room. The Princess, too, came sometimes to music, and to play in the Queen's gallery at night, but the Prince never. The Queen was always very easy with her, and used to acknowledge she should be the weakest creature in the world, as well as the most unjust, if she took anything ill of the Princess; for that she knew the Princess did nothing without the Prince's order, and must do everything he did order her. For which reason I once heard the Queen add: "Poor creature, if she were to spit in my face, I should only pity her for being under such a fool's direction, and wipe it off." And to give the Queen her due, she was always remarkably and industriously civil to her and has often said to me she thought there was no sort of harm in her, that she never meant to offend, was very modest and very respectful, and that for her want of understanding it was what to be sure fatigued one when one was obliged to be with her, but what one must want understanding oneself to be angry with her for not having. When Lord Hervey used to come to the Queen in the afternoon, those days the Prince and Princess had dined with her, the Queen used generally to accost him with yawning and complaining of the vapours; telling him often at the same time, that the silly gaiety and *fade railleries* of her son, joined to the silent stupidity of her *ennuyante* daughter-in-law, had oppressed her to that degree that she was ready to cry with the fatigue of their company, and felt herself more tired than she believed she should have

done if she had carried them round the garden on her 1736
back.

During this summer a licentious, riotous, seditious, and almost ungovernable spirit in the people showed itself in many tumults and disorders, in different shapes, and in several parts of the kingdom. In the West the people of the country rose in great numbers to oppose the exportation of corn, knowing that practice raised the price of corn in the home markets, and made it dearer to these mutineers; but as this commerce was a great national advantage, and experienced so particularly in the last war, so the farmers were not only permitted by the Legislature to exercise it, but had by Act of Parliament a bounty of five shillings per quarter allowed upon it.

The interruptions the people of the country gave to this trade this summer were so great that the civil power alone was not sufficient to protect the farmers in carrying it on, but was forced to call the military force in aid, which quelled for a time the open opposition made by these rioters, but rather irritated than allayed the spirit from which that opposition sprung.

A riot of another kind happened in Spitalfields. Several *July 18-19*
Irishmen being employed there by the weavers and working at a lower rate than the English journeymen, the English, fearing this might in time come to reduce their price, all rose in combination to oblige the Irish to quit this trade, killed some, wounded many, defaced and threatened to pull down the houses of those who hired them, and swore they would never be quiet whilst one single Irishman was employed. On the unreasonableness of this proceeding in the English I need not descant, since it is obvious that their demands were as unjust as the manner of making them was illegal. This riot lasted three or four days; and though it began on a point in which the Government seemed to be little concerned, yet mobs and multitudes, by what accident soever they are first assembled, are always objects worthy the care of a Government; as those

1736 who wish ill to a Government may turn a flame they had no hand in kindling to annoy such persons as at first it was not intended to touch nor thought likely to reach.

This was the case of the Spitalfields weavers, who began with railing against Irishmen, but came in twenty-four hours to cursing of Germans, reviling the King and the Queen, and huzzaing for James III. The troops were sent to assist the civil magistrate in quelling this tumult also; but the magistrate who read the proclamation to disperse the rioters made a great blunder, by seizing some persons, after he had read the proclamation, before the hour was expired which the Act allows to the rioters to disperse before it is construed felony to remain there.

However, these seizures, though they were not made in such a manner as to make those who were seized incur a capital punishment, yet had their effect so far as to intimidate and disperse the rest. But the rioters carried their point in banishing the Irish, none of the great dealers daring to employ them.

I must here cursorily observe the hard situation of the soldiery on these occasions, as the law of this country now stands. The soldiers by law cannot fire unless attacked by fire-arms; if they do, they are guilty of murder. When, therefore, two or three hundred men are ordered by their officers to go against two or three thousand rioters, if they refuse to go it is mutiny, and they will be condemned by a court-martial and shot; if they go, and do not fire, they will probably be knocked on the head; and if they do fire and kill anybody, they will be tried by a jury and hanged. Such are the absurdities of our laws with regard to the army at present. But if standing troops are necessary to be kept up in this country, and that the civil power cannot put the laws in execution without the assistance of the military power, it is hard that the laws and the civil power should not protect their own support; and in the case of smuggling that practice is so increased of late years, and is got to such a height in all the countries round the coasts,

and the smugglers are associated in such numerous bands, 1736 and are so well mounted and armed, that this country, if it were not for the army, would certainly be overrun by these trafficking robbers, and all the acts of Parliament relating to the revenue no more regarded in any part of them than they are in the oaths they impose.

The severe law passed the last session to make this offence capital for a short time suppressed the practice of smuggling; but it soon became as universal as before the law was passed, and the penalty being so much greater only made it more difficult to condemn those who incurred it, as in capital cases fewer people are willing to inform, and juries more reluctant to condemn.

In many places in England turnpikes, too, were now thought grievances, and were the occasion of many riots, which without the troops could never be kept within any tolerable bounds; and, even assisted by them, the civil power could not prevent many turnpikes from being cut down and destroyed.

There was this summer, too, an occurrence in Westminster Hall which was as much talked of for a time as any I have mentioned. Whilst the courts were all sitting, July 14 the judges on the benches, the counsel pleading, and the Hall full of lawyers and clients, all on a sudden, at the corner of the Court of Chancery, there was such a loud report from a discharge of gunpowder that the whole Hall was in a moment in the utmost confusion; and, everybody concluding it was a plot to blow up the Hall, the judges started from the benches, the lawyers were all running over one another's backs to make their escape, some losing part of their gowns, others their periwigs, in the scuffle; and such an uproar it occasioned, that nobody thought his own life was safe, or knew how it came to be in danger. When the tumult subsided a little, and an examination was made into this matter, part of the bag in which the gunpowder had been lodged was found, bills of five Acts of Parliament which had been blown up

1736 with it, and vast numbers of copies of a printed paper, which it was thought this contrivance was laid purposely to disperse with éclat. What follows were the words of this printed paper:

Wednesday, July 14, 1736.

By a general consent of the citizens and tradesmen of London, Westminster, and the Borough of Southwark, this being the last day of term, were publicly burnt, between the hours of twelve and two, at the Royal Exchange, Cornhill, at Westminster Hall (the courts then sitting), and at Margaret's Hill, Southwark, as destructive of the product, trade, and manufacture of this kingdom and the plantations thereunto belonging, and tending to the utter subversive of the liberties and properties thereof, the five following printed books, or libels, called Acts of Parliament: viz.

1. An Act to prohibit the sale of distilled spirituous liquors. [Gin Act.]
2. An Act entirely to extinguish the small remains of charity yet subsisting amongst us. [Mortmain Act.]
3. An Act to prevent carriages and passengers coming over London Bridge, to the great detriment of the trade and commerce of the City of London and the Borough of Southwark. [The Westminster Bridge Act.]
4. An Act to seize all innocent gentlemen travelling with arms for their own defence, called the Smugglers' Act.
5. An Act to enable a foreign prince to borrow £600,000 of money sacredly appropriated to the Payment of our Debts.¹

God save the King!

Nobody, however, could tell who had put the bag in the place where it was blown up, nor did anybody see how the fire had been applied to it.

My Lord Chancellor and my Lord Hardwicke were so nettled at the ridicule the lawyers had incurred, as well as the affront and insult offered to the courts of justice, that they applied to the Queen to have a Council summoned the very next day at Kensington, where they each of them made a long speech, setting forth, with a

¹The Act was "to enable His Majesty to apply 600,000*l.* of the Sinking Fund to the service of the year."

narrative of the fact, the heinousness of the crime, and the necessity of inquiring into and punishing so impudent a treason, for so at first they called it, though they could not afterwards in a legal prosecution construe the paper to be such. 1736

The Queen immediately in Council ordered a proclamation, offering a reward for the discovery of those concerned in the transaction, and pardon to any one who should inform against his accomplices, so as to bring them to justice; and, on a strict search, it proved to be a Non-juring parson, half mad, and quite a beggar, whom the lawyers should have sent to Bedlam, would have sent to Tyburn, and could only send to rot in jail.

Another riot and rising was expected to happen on Michaelmas Day, when the Act passed the last session to prevent the sale of distilled spirituous liquors to the common people was to take place. Sir Robert Walpole had several letters sent him, in a style in which he had received many on other occasions, as well as this and the excise, to tell him that he should certainly not be suffered to outlive that day; though, indeed, the Act was entirely owing to Sir Joseph Jekyll, the Master of the Rolls, whose reforming principles in this measure were much more reasonable than they were on many others; for the drunkenness of the common people was so universal, by the retailing of a liquor called gin, with which they could get dead drunk for a groat, that the whole town of London, and many towns in the country, swarmed with drunken people of both sexes from morning to night, and were more like a scene of a Bacchanal than the residence of a civil society.

However, by the great care taken by the Government, this riot was prevented, both horse and foot guards being posted and appointed to patrol day and night some time before and long after Michaelmas Day, throughout all the streets of London and Westminster. The guards at Kensington were doubled; and Sir Robert Walpole, rather,

1736 I believe, to mark out who was the author of this Act than in favour to the Master of the Rolls (for he hated him heartily), got a particular guard of thirty men to be set round the Master's house, under the pretence and show of protecting it from the attacks of the mob.

But the riot which made the most noise of any that happened this year, and one of the most extraordinary nature that ever happened in any country, was an insurrection in Edinburgh in Scotland.

One Andrew Wilson, a notorious smuggler, having been condemned for not contenting himself with defrauding the King of his duties, but for robbing some of the officers of the revenue of money they had collected, it was apprehended that the mob of Edinburgh, who always favoured these sort of offenders, would make an attempt to rescue him as he was leading to execution. The magistrates of Edinburgh therefore ordered the Town Guard to be drawn out to defend the officers of justice, and secure the prisoner at the place of execution, and likewise sent to the commanding officer of the King's troops to be ready to assist, in case his aid should be wanting.

Just after the execution a tumult arose, and the mob began to throw stones at the executioner and at the Town Guard; whereupon Captain Porteous, commander of the Town Guard, ordered his men to fire among the multitude, which was assembled there to the number of many thousands. Several people were killed, to the number of eight, and many more wounded, by this discharge of the fire-arms of the guard; and the mob were so enraged against Captain Porteous for what he had done, that when he was leading to prison in order to be put upon his trial, and afterward from prison to his trial, it was with great difficulty they were prevented from tearing him to pieces. The jury brought in a verdict on which the judges condemned him, which appeased the rage of the mob by promising his life to satisfy it. But as Captain Porteous's case, by the cooler and better sort of people in Scotland,

was thought a hard one, a petition, signed by vast numbers of the nobility and gentry of Scotland, was sent to the Queen (now Regent) to exercise the mercy of the Crown in his favour. Accordingly the Queen sent down a reprieve, at which the mob were so incensed that the night preceding that day fixed by the judges for the execution they assembled to the number of four or five thousand, seized and shut the city gates, possessed themselves of the arms of the City Guard, set fire to the prison-gate, released every prisoner there confined but Captain Porteous, and dragged him from the prison to a place called the Grassmarket, the ordinary place for the execution of malefactors, and there, with all the solemnity of a legal execution, hanged him; some of them saying they would show the world that there was no authority should have power to dispense with the laws of Scotland, and others talking in the coarsest and most opprobrious terms of the Queen and her reprieve. As soon as this cool, deliberate, and horrid murder was committed the mob dispersed without further violence or disturbance to any one.

That something of this nature would be attempted, in case the Queen pardoned or reprieved Captain Porteous, was commonly reported not only in Edinburgh, but over almost all Scotland, long before the thing happened, from whence it was concluded, by the negligence and remissness of the magistrates in taking measures to prevent it, that the magistrates either wished this murder as much as those by whom it was perpetrated, or were afraid to oppose what seemed to be the universal bent of the lower sort of people (at least) of the whole country.

General Moyle, who commanded the King's troops at this time in Scotland, was much blamed for his conduct on this occasion. This was his case. General Wade, commander-in-chief of all His Majesty's forces in Scotland, had given Moyle orders, when he left the command to him, not to send any of the King's forces to assist the civil magistrate, unless demanded in writing, or unless

1736 a civil magistrate came himself and offered to go along with the troops and head them. Wade's reason for leaving such orders was that he himself had once gone on verbal orders only from the civil magistrate, and though he had been desired by the magistrate to fire, yet upon his doing so, and quelling a tumult that could not have been suppressed without it, some people being killed, the magistrate disavowed General Wade in this proceeding, and told Wade himself, when all was quiet, that Wade must answer for the blood that had been spilt.

However, in Wade's orders left with Moyle not to send troops without a written order there was a parenthesis that excepted the case of assisting the officers of the revenue, or the prevention of immediate bloodshed; and for this reason, Mr. Lindsay, one of the representatives of the city, having been sent with verbal orders during the time of the riot from the Lord Provost of Edinburgh to General Moyle to desire him to march immediately the King's troops to his assistance, Moyle was by most people thought to be in the wrong for not obeying. However, as nobody suspected him to wish well to the undertaking of these rioters, and that he was a neighbour and relation of the Duke of Grafton's and Lord Hervey's in Suffolk, they both took the turn immediately of excusing him at Kensington, and getting Sir Robert Walpole to join with them, they brought the Queen to temper; who, when first the account of this whole affair was brought to Court, declared, with more warmth than I ever knew her show on any other occasion, that Moyle deserved to be shot by order of a court-martial, as much as any of the rioters deserved to be hanged. Sir Robert Walpole, too, in private to Lord Hervey, told him Moyle either deserved to be broke for a coward, begged for a fool, or hanged for a knave. Lord Hervey only smiled in answer to Sir Robert's accusation of General Moyle, but softened the Queen by telling her, since the law was so severe upon officers who were too rash on these occasions,


their situation was a terrible one if the Crown should be 1736
equally severe when they were too cautious.

It was evident that the magistrates of Edinburgh were as unwilling or as fearful of punishing this riot as they had been to prevent it; for notwithstanding the numbers concerned in it there was not one single person taken up for it till Lord Ilay was sent down to Scotland, and even then he could get information made against one man only, which was a footman to Lady Wemyss; and Lord Ilay wrote to England to say the whole country was so zealous in this matter, that let him commit ever so many, it would be impossible to get witnesses against them, or if he could get witnesses, to get a jury who would regard them; and the acquittal afterwards of this footman, who was proved to be one of those who put the rope about Captain Porteous's neck, verified Lord Ilay's report.

Considering this whole proceeding from its commencement to its conclusion, that is, from the legal execution of Wilson to the illegal execution of unfortunate Captain Porteous, it looked as if the people of Edinburgh were determined to take the decision of all criminal cases into their own hands, and to suffer no man to be executed whom they thought fit to spare, nor any man to be spared whom they thought fit to execute. The Queen, therefore, resented this conduct of the Scotch as a tendency to shake off all government; and, I believe, was a little more irritated from considering it in some degree as a personal affront to her, who had sent down Captain Porteous's reprieve; and had she been told half what was reported to have been said of her by the Scotch mob on this occasion, no one could think she had not ample cause to be provoked.

All these commotions, added to the secret history of her own family, furnished matter sufficient to fill reams of paper, which she wrote this summer to the King, who was extremely dissatisfied that so few people could be hanged when so many had deserved it; and I suppose

1736 said often at Hanover on these occasions, as I heard him impolitically and indecently in England on many others, that the laws here were so loose, that not half the people were condemned that ought to be; and he would then add with a pert cruel air: "But if they come into my hands, I shall never spare them."

During this whole summer, notwithstanding  these tumults and commotions, the Queen was in as good-humour, health, and spirits, as I ever saw her. Her pride was shocked, and she seemed a good deal hurt, for some time after the King went; but this cloud soon dispersed, and the being freed from his ill-humour seemed to be a full compensation for all his good-humour being bestowed elsewhere.

Lord Hervey was with her this summer at Kensington every day, and almost all day, Saturdays excepted, which she always passed at Kew, and he in London. Some of the things he wrote for her amusement I will here insert, as they will contribute to illustrate the characters of many people in the Court, as well as several of the little occurrences and transactions of these times. The first of the two pieces that I shall here transcribe was written upon the Queen's bidding him write no more—an epigram in Martial, which he had paraphrased and applied to Lord Burlington's House at Chiswick, and his Lordship's performances as an architect, having got about and made Lord and Lady Burlington, and their friend, his Grace of Grafton, extremely angry with him.¹ The prose dramatic piece that follows was written on the Queen's saying what

¹The epigram, I presume, was:

"Possess'd of one great hall for state,
Without a place to sleep or eat;
How well you build let flattery tell,
And all mankind how ill you dwell!"

which is a paraphrase of the last of the eight lines of the 50th Epigram of Martial's 12th book:

"Atria longa patent: sed nec cunctantibus usquam
Nec somno locus est: quam bene non habitas!"—*Croker.*

an alteration in the Palace Lord Hervey's death would 1736
make, how many people would mourn, and how many
rejoice; to which Lord Hervey replied, he believed he
could guess just how it would be; and being pressed to
tell, said he would do it in writing.

TO THE QUEEN

[With notes by Lord Hervey.*]

'Tis true, great Queen! I have your dread commands
 No more with ink to stain these scribbling hands;
 No more in duchtich verset, or teuflisch† prose,
 To raccommode my friends, or lash my foes;
 But how shall I this flippant pen restrain,
 Like hellebore so long has purg'd my brain?
 I should go mad were I to stop the drain! }

If, then, like Midas' barber I am curst,
 And feel that I must either vent or burst;
 Allow me still those midwives, pen and ink,
 To You, at least, let me on paper think.
 'Tis a sharp labour¹—You may make it safe;
 I shall be brought to bed, and you will laugh.
 To you I'll tell each Betty-Cotton² tale
 And harmless joke, whilst sourer blockheads rail.
 Let Fog and Danvers³ call each courtier slave,
 Each senator a mean corrupted knave,
 And all your Palace crew, from prow to helm,
 Huns-nas, bernheuter, reckel, hecks, and schelm,⁴
 Let envious Brudenell⁵ her great friends abuse,
 And little Titch⁶ with lower scandal souse;
 'Tis no such rancour stimulates my soul,

¹Alluding to some cant language often used by the Queen upon a story Lord Hervey told her too long to be related.

²Another cant word for secret.

³Two of the weekly journalists that wrote against the Court.

⁴German words for rogue, rascal, coward, scoundrel, and villain.

⁵Mrs. Brudenell, one of the Queen's Bedchamber women, and very ill-tempered.

⁶Mrs. Titchburne, another of the Queen's women of the Bedchamber, with a better head than the other, and the same disposition.

*The Windsor copy of this piece ■ annotated by Lord Hervey whose notes are shown above the line. Where an obscure allusion is left unexplained ■ is because Hervey has omitted and his editors have been unable to explain it.

†Misspelt German words meaning "strong, competent" (tüchtig), and "devilish" (teuflisch).

I only ask to call a fool a fool:

No vice to give, no virtue to deny;

■ would no more than Lady Sundon lie;

And ne'er a present or an absent friend

Or basely will give up, or cool defend;

Not e'en my foes I would unhappy make;

To smile ■ all the liberty I'll take.

And freely thus, whilst I unpack my breast,
Where safer can the cargo be address'd

Than to my gracious Queen, who, angry, spares,

And, whilst she chides my faults, my folly bears?

Whose goodness ev'ry day and hour I prove,

And look upon, like heav'n, with fear and love:

Whose mercy still, when I offend, I trust,

Owning the rules I swerve from to be just:

Whose sense I feel, whose merit I discern,

And wish to practise what I daily learn:

I wish my conduct to your maxims true,

Yet can't that conduct I approve pursue.

With gifts so rare Thee partial Heav'n has bless'd,

Your rank is less uncommon than the rest;

With ev'ry good of nature or of art,

Or for the social or the Royal part;

Whatever dignifies or softens state;

In private amiable, in public great;

With all those qualities that recommend

The best companion or the kindest friend;

When serious, just; when gay, for ever new;

Quick in discernment, in reflection true;

All that the Greek or Roman sages thought—

What Plato, Socrates, or Tully wrote,

Philosophers or moralists have taught,

Drawn from the head, and dictated by art—

Was the prophetic picture of Thy heart;

By precept they, You by example teach,

And practise ev'ry virtue which they preach:

Whate'er the grave historian's page has shown—

Whate'er experience tells, to Thee is known—

The ancient and the modern world Thy own:

Whilst policy on maxims unrefin'd,

To gentle sway and steady conduct join'd,

The mildest temper and the firmest mind,

Told to the distant, by the nearer seen,
Complete the woman, and adorn the Queen;
A Queen whom most proclaim, and none disown,
An ornament and bulwark to her throne.

If, then, each morning with your converse fir'd,
(These talents ponder'd, and these gifts admir'd),
When ■ the trappings and constraint of pride,
For ease postpon'd, for pleasure thrown aside;
Your words no longer dictated by art;
Your mind unloaded, and unlock'd your heart;
When each Court-animal, from first to last,
Like those in Eden in review has pass'd,
And each—I won't say brute—receiv'd its name }
According to the merits of its claim,
Or mischievously wild or dully tame:
Pursuant to the sketch such scenes afford,
If I their worth endeavour to record—
If from your presence afterward retir'd,
When, only pleas'd, I fancy I'm inspir'd,
And recollecting in my pensive walk,
Think I can write as I have heard you talk;
So well the merit of Your style is known,
It can't seem strange, or strange to you alone,
When I would have mine please I choose your own. }
May I not then, great Queen, your pardon claim?
Should any priest his own enthusiast blame? }
Should those reproach the stroke who give the aim?
Or—cordials to a feeble brain applied—
Should those who made us drunk our transports chide?
No worse a canting parson Satan paints,
Who damns the devils he made for not being saints.
Oh! let me then describe, without control,
This idiot pon, or t' other idiot troll;
Some are so great, to name them is offence;
But mayn't I mention Mrs. Eighteen-Pence?
Or Privy Nasy¹ with his open mouth,
His eyes half shut, and at each corner froth?
When, grinning horrible a ghastly smile,
I hear him (snorting, belching, all the while)
Tell you that "two and two he's sure makes four;

¹A cant name given by the Princesses to Lord Wilmington, President of the Council.

That fruit too ripe is flat, unripe is sour."

Internally, at least (that's not uncivil),

Good Queen, let me repeat, "Oh! dummer Teuffel!"¹

Much harder measure at Your hands he found;

My touch is but a fillip, Yours a wound.

When Cow-Tail,² tott'ring, waddles through your rooms,

And with his useless velvet budget comes,

Mayn't I reflect upon his riddle-fate,

Obscure in eminence and mean in state?

An exile made, by an uncommon doom,

From foreign countries to his native home;³

In vain with titles and distinctions grac'd,

By favours hurt, by dignities debas'd,

And sunk upon the steps that others rais'd.

This statesman's fortune (odd as it may sound)

In that of your old china may be found;

For first at an enormous price you bought him,

Then never us'd him, and, laid by, forgot him.

In verse or prose, when privately I play

With characters like these, seen ev'ry day,

If for admittance to your eyes I plead

That some great princes certainly could read,

Though I confess, alas! they're long since dead;

If, to this honour when I lay my claim,

Great sovereigns and great authors I should name;

Say, to Augustus polish'd Horace wrote,

And Trajan deigned to read what Pliny thought;

Perhaps my works you'll promise to admit

When I have Pliny's sense or Horace's wit.

But though, great Queen! their talents I may want,

And only daub when these great masters paint,

Yet for your mirth the liveliest you may keep,

¹Dull devil in German.

²Lord Harrington, made Secretary of State and a peer, nobody knew why, and after he was so continued there, though disliked by the King, Queen, and Sir Robert Walpole, only because they did not know who to put in his place.

³After the Treaty of Seville he was made a peer and Secretary of State and of course recalled from Spain, where everything then important passed through his hands, and when he came back he did nothing and was trusted with nothing.

La Behn¹ shall read the dullest whilst you sleep;
 And sure in sleep no dulness you need fear,
 Who, ev'n awake, can Schutz and Lifford bear;
 Who ev'ry Sunday suffer stupid Sloane²
 To preach on a dried fly and Hampstead stone,
 To show such wonders as were never seen,
 And give accounts of what have never been;
 Who ev'ry Wednesday hear Montandre³ prate }
 Of politics and maxims out of date,
 And with old fringes furbelow the State.
 As well that Ever-Green his wife might boast
 The long-fled bloom of a last century toast;
 The same poor antiquated merits grace
 The Politician's head and Beauty's face.
 Each in their diff'rent style have equal charms;
 I'd ask his counsel, as I'd court her arms.

But what can You, oh Queen! from dulness dread,
 Who can resist such loads of verbal lead?
 Who, if stupidity did poison bear,
 Must die, like Hamlet, poison'd at your ear;
 When, after Walpole's clear strong sense, you deign }
 To let his echo,⁴ in enervate strain,
 Lisp all that sense in nonsense o'er again;
 By turns of Asoph⁵ and of Clermont⁶ talk, }
 Of armies' marches, and a well-turf'd walk,
 A falling empire, and a planted oak.
 Thrice happy genius! that can handle still
 These diff'ring topics with an equal skill;
 Yet some allege these honours not his own,

¹An underservant to the Queen, who used to read her to sleep.

²Sir Hans Sloane, a physician by profession, a very dull fellow, a great naturalist, and a very careful and expensive collector of what few people besides himself would give a shilling for.

³An old French gentleman, with no more of the vivacity of his countrymen than their religion, who fancied, because he had read a great deal, that he knew a great deal. A great talker, by which he instructed others no better than by reading had instructed himself.

⁴The Duke of Newcastle, Secretary of State.

⁵Besieged this summer by the Russians at war with the Turks.

⁶The Duke of Newcastle's villa.

Kent¹ makes his gardens, his despatches Stone,²
 But this ■ all the envy of a Court
 (Where worth resides will envy still resort),
 For Stone to aid his Grace no more is able
 Than Backenswants to manage Pomfret's stable.³

Whilst things like these each hour I see and hear—

If this vain world was all your servant's care,
 I own 't were better silently to pass,
 Nor heed the chatt'ring ape nor braying ass;
 But as I think 't ■ better for my soul
 I should not, what Heav'n seems to will, control;
 And as by the devoutest lips 't is said
 That God for nothing nothing ever made;
 So when these animals come 'cross my way,
 I laugh with that devotion others pray,
 Thinking I execute the will of Heav'n;
 For to what other end could they be given?
 Name any other, I'll from this refrain;
 But, well consider'd, boldly I maintain,
 Unridicul'd, their being would be vain. }
 As well we might, in spite of Nature, try
 To make fat geese like carrier-pigeons fly;
 Bid the slow ass like the train'd race-horse run,
 Or darkling owls like eagles face the sun,
 As make the human owl, or goose, or ass,
 For any species but its own to pass;
 Or e'er attempt, by any rule of Court,
 To turn to bus'ness what was meant for sport.
 As then Court-brutes, who nothing understand,
 Should never lead a Queen but by the hand,
 You may direct, but ne'er consult a fool;
 None set the horse to drive that ought to pull;

¹A man much in fashion as a gardener, an architect, a painter, and about fifty other things, with a very bad taste and little understanding, but had the good luck to make several people who had no taste or understanding of their own believe that they could borrow both of him, and had paid for their error by ruining their fortunes in making gardens and building houses that nobody could live in and everybody laughed at.

²The Duke of Newcastle's first *commis*.

³A German groom, who did order and manage everything in the Queen's stables, whilst Lord Pomfret, a great fool, was her Master of the Horse.

And thus at Council when I see his Grace,
 (The term's so gen'ral, pray you let him pass,)
 Methinks I see your coach-horse in Drost's¹ place. }

But art to falsify God's coin is vain;
 The head he stamps with fool shall fool remain;
 For varnish, mill, or clip it e'er so much,
 Your sterling fools will answer to the touch;
 Or did the touch-stone not decide their fate,
 Like gold, you still may know them by their weight.
 Well as I can I nature then pursue;
 Through microscopes or prisms nothing view;
 Nothing to paint or magnify I try,
 Behold each object with my naked eye;
 Nor strive to force the things that will recoil,
 But strive myself to things to reconcile—
 I learn from Walpole, at Newcastle smile. }

Yet think not, whilst these methods I pursue,
 And give each Cæsar what is Cæsar's due,
 That I their int'rest or their peace would shake; }
 Rest without molestation may they take,
 Or in their sleep, or what they call awake; }
 And if the brain that never thinks, can dream,
 Of either slumber, pleasure be the theme!
 Nor with their bus'ness would I interfere;
 Let each great courtier dignify his sphere;
 Let Shaw² snuff candles when at night you play,
 And when you dress at noon, your chaplains pray;
 Let all the Cabinet, with ductile hand,
 Sign what they read, and never understand;
 Let dupes you rally thankfully receive it;
 Let Teed³ mill chocolate, and Purcel⁴ give it.
 What others dictate, let great statesmen write,
 And we Gold Keys learn all to read at sight.
 Let Wilmington, with grave, contracted brow,
 Red tape and wisdom at the Council show,
 Sleep in the senate, in the circle bow, }

¹The Queen's coachman.

²One of the Queen's pages of the backstairs.

³The Queen's chocolate maker.

⁴The King's laundress, that was always about the Queen in a morning to bring her breakfast. A forward, pert, silly woman.

Let Harrington still strive, and Ilay¹ swim,
 This always with, and that against the stream;
 Argyll abuse the Bishops, Bishops him,
 Till e'en abuse becomes a tedious theme.
 Let Hare² abjure the heresies he wrote,
 And broil us all for being what he taught.
 Sherlock³ the Church's crippled state deplore,
 Give up her doctrines, but still grasp her pow'r.
 Gibson⁴ cabal, and honest Potter⁵ grunt;
 Grantham⁶ set chairs, and wiser Grafton⁷ hunt.
 Let one, the extent of his discourse to show,
 Vary comment ça va? and how you do?
 T'other his journals eloquently tell,
 Which hound first hit it off, what horse did well.
 Let nauseous Selkirk⁸ shake his empty head
 Through six courts more, when six have wish'd him dead,
 Charlotte⁹ and Schutz like angry monkeys chatter,
 None guessing what's the language or the matter.
 Let Pembroke¹⁰ still in midwife's bawdy tell ye
 The pregnant fables of her barren belly.
 And Dame Palladio, insolent and bold,
 Like her own chairman, whistle, stamp, and scold;
 Her quiet still preserv'd, though lost her fame,
 As free from ev'ry punishment as shame;

¹Lord Ilay, brother to the Duke of Argyll, whom Sir Robert Walpole employed in the management of all Scotch elections and all Scotch affairs.

²The Bishop of Chichester.

³Bishop of Salisbury.

⁴Bishop of London.

⁵Bishop of Oxford, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury.

⁶The Queen's Lord Chamberlain, an old stupid Dutchman, whose vocabulary did not consist of above twenty words, and even these he did not understand the meaning of.

⁷The King's Lord Chamberlain, an English edition of the Queen's, very little improved, whose only pleasure was hunting.

⁸An old paralytic Scotch earl, the servile follower of every King *de facto*, and every Minister in power.

⁹Lady Charlotte de Roucy, a very harmless French Protestant, of very great family, pensioned by the English Court, and used to be constantly of the Queen's private quadrille parties.

¹⁰The Dowager Countess, married to Sir [sic.] J. Mordaunt.

Her worn-out huntsman frequent may she hold;
Nor to her mason-husband be it told
That she, with capital Corinthian grac'd,
Has finish'd his in the Ionic taste.*

I could enumerate a hundred more,
But for your sake the tedious list give o'er;
And end this rhyming circle I have run
Just with the same petition || begun.
Freely my thoughts of men and things to write,
Veil'd by my well-lock'd bureau from the light;
Or, like choice pictures, hid from common view,
To draw the curtain back to only You.

And when from all the irksome cares that wait
On rank or power, on eminence and state,
You wish to borrow one relaxing hour,
To think of Swedish¹ subsidies no more,
Domestic feuds, or Europe's balanc'd pow'r; }
How long your fleet near Tagus' banks must wait;²
Or Montemar³ maintain the Tuscan state;
When from these thoughts to trifles you unbend, }
And with superior taste e'en those attend,
Sure he who can amuse you is your friend. }
Or in that title if too much he claim,
A faithful servant half deserves the name;
And though more useful, none can be more true
Than I, my lov'd and honour'd Queen! to You;
Whose pleasures all my thoughts and hours employ—
Your service all my aim, Your favour all my joy.

¹A treaty was then upon the anvil with Sweden.

²The English fleet then lay before Lisbon.

³The Duke of Montemar, the Spanish General.

*For the explanation of these allusions to Lord and Lady Burlington and the Duke of Grafton see pp. 188 and 574. Croker explains that "Corinthian" means "brazen-faced" and that the volutes of Ionic capitals were sometimes called "horns."

THE DEATH OF LORD HERVEY

OR, A MORNING AT COURT

A DRAMA¹

ACT I

SCENE.—*The Queen's Gallery. The time, nine in the morning.**Enter the QUEEN, PRINCESS EMILY, PRINCESS CAROLINE, followed by LORD LIFFORD and MRS. PURCEL.**Queen.* Mon Dieu, quelle chaleur! en vérité on étouffe. Pray open a little those windows.*Lord Lifford.* Haza Your Majesty heara de news?*Queen.* What news, my dear Lord?*Lord Liff.* Dat my Lord Hervey, as he was coming last night to tone, was rob and murdered by highwaymen and tron in a ditch.*Princess Caroline.* Eh! grand Dieu!*Queen* [*striking her hand upon her knee*]. Comment, est il véritablement mort? Purcel, my angel, shall I not have a little breakfast?*Mrs. Purcel.* What would Your Majesty please to have?*Queen.* A little chocolate, my soul, if you give me leave; and a little sour cream and some fruit.[*Exit Mrs. PURCEL.*]*Queen* [*to LORD L.*]. Eh! bien, my Lord Lifford, dites nous un peu comment cela est arrivé. I cannot imagine what he had to do to be putting his nose there. Seulement pour un sot voyage avec ce petit mousse²—eh bien?*Lord Liff.* Madame, on sçait quelque chose de cela de Mon. Maran³ qui d'abord qu'il a vu les voleurs s'est enfui et venu ■ grand galoppe à Londres, and after dat a waggoner take up the bady and put ■ in his cart.*Queen* [*to PRINCESS EMILY*]. Are you not ashamed, Amalie, to laugh?¹This piece is missing from the Windsor copy and in the original manuscript it is unannotated.²Lord Hervey's second son, Augustus, afterwards Admiral and 3rd Earl.³Lord Hervey's valet.

1736 *Princess Emily.* I only laughed at the cart, mama.

Queen. Ah! that is a very fade plaisanterie.

Princess Em. But if I may say it, mama, I am not very sorry.

Queen. Ah! fie donc! Eh bien! my Lord Lifford! My God, where is this chocolate, Purcel?

Re-enter MRS. PURCEL, with the chocolate and fruit.

Queen [to MRS. PURCEL]. Well, I am sure Purcel now is very sorry for my Lord Hervey: have you heard it?

Mrs. Purcel. Yes, Madam; and I am always sorry when Your Majesty loses anything that entertains you.

Queen. Look you there now, Amalie; I swear now Purcel is thousand times better as you.

Princess Em. I did not say I was not sorry for mama; but I am not sorry for him.

Queen. And why not?

Princess Em. What, for that creature!

Princess Car. I cannot imagine why one should not be sorry for him: I think it very dure not to be sorry for him. I own he used to laugh malapropos sometimes, but he was mightily mended; and for people that were civil to him he was always ready to do anything to oblige them; and for my part I am sorry, I assure.

Princess Em. Mama, Caroline is duchtich¹; for my part I cannot paroltre.

Queen. Ah! ah! You can paroltre and be duchtich very well sometimes; but this is no paroltre; and I think you are very great brute. I swear now he was very good, poor my Lord Hervey; and with people's lives that is no jest. My dear Purcel, this is the nastiest fruit I have ever tasted; is there none of the Duke of Newcastle's? or that old fool Johnstone's?² Il étoit bien joli quelquefois, my Lord Hervey; was he not, Lifford?

Lord Liff. [taking snuff]. Ees, ended he was ver pretty company sometimes.

PRINCESS E. shrugs her shoulders and laughs again.

Queen [to PRINCESS EMILY]. If you did not think him company, I am sorry for your taste. [To PRINCESS CAROLINE.] My God, Caroline, you will twist off the thumbs of your glove. Mais, my Lord Lifford, qui vous a conté tout ça des voleurs, du ditch, et des wagoners?

Lord Liff. I have hear it at St. James, et tout le monde en parle.

¹See Note on p. 576.

²James Johnstone (1643-1737), Secretary for Scotland, 1692-6.

Queen [to MRS. PURCEL]. Have you sent, Purcel, to Vickers 1736
about my clothes?

Mrs. Purcel. He is here, if Your Majesty pleases to see the stuffs.

Queen. No, my angel, I must write now. Adieu, adieu, adieu, my
Lord Lifford.

QUEEN and the two PRINCESSES alone.

Queen. Mais, diable, Amalie, pourquoi est ce que vous voulez
faire croire à tout le monde que vous êtes dure comme cette table?
[Strikes the table with her hand.]

Princess Em. En vérité, mama, je n'ai jamais fait semblant de
l'aimer pendant qu'il étoit en vie, et je ne sais pas pourquoi donc je
devrois faire semblant de le pleurer à cette heure qu'il est mort.

Queen. Ah! psha; n'y a-t-il point de différence entre pleurer les
gens, et rire de leur malheur. Outre cela vous aviez grandissime tort
même quand ■ étoit en vie; car il s'est comporté envers vous avec
beaucoup de respect; et jamais je crois a-t-il dit le moindre imper-
tinance sur votre sujet.

Princess Em. Pour moi, je crois qu'il en a dit cent milles.

Queen. Vous faites fort bien de dire que vous le croyez pour vous
excuser.

Princess Car. Pour moi, je ne le crois pas; je ne dis pas que la
Emilie n'a pas raison de le croire; parce qu'il y a mille gens qui
pensent faire leur cour en disant qu'ils l'ont entendu parler imper-
tinement; mais je n'ai jamais entendu de ces choses dans son stile, et
je connais son stile; et outre cela il m'a paru s'être fait une règle de
ne le point faire.

Queen. Eh bien! adieu, mes chères enfans, il est tard. Dites un
peu en passant que la Mailbone¹ soit prête. [Exeunt.]

ACT ■

SCENE.—The QUEEN's dressing-room. The QUEEN is discovered at
her toilet cleaning her teeth; MRS. PURCEL dressing Her Majesty's
head; The PRINCESSES, LADY PEMEROKE and LADY BURLING-
TON, Ladies of the Bedchamber, and LADY SUNDON, Woman of
the Bedchamber, standing round. Morning prayers saying in the
next room.

1 Parson (behind the scenes). "From pride, vain glory, and
hypocrisy, from envy, hatred, and malice, and all uncharitableness,"

2 Parson. "Good Lord deliver us!"

¹Her German nurse.

1736 *Queen.* I pray, my good Lady Sundon, shut a little that door: those creatures pray so loud, one cannot hear oneself speak. (*LADY SUNDON goes to shut the door.*) So, so, not quite so much; leave it enough open for those parsons to think we may hear, and enough shut that we may not hear quite so much. [*To LADY BURLINGTON.*] What do you say, Lady Burlington, to poor Lord Hervey's death? I am sure you are very sorry.

Lady Pem. (*sighing and lifting up her eyes*). I swear it is a terrible thing.

Lady Burl. I am just as sorry as I believe he would have been for me.

Queen. How sorry is that, my good Lady Burlington?

Lady Burl. Not so sorry as not to admit of consolation.

Queen. I am sure you have not forgiven him his jokes upon Chiswick. I used to scold him for that too, for Chiswick is the prettiest thing I ever saw in my life. But I must say, poor my Lord Hervey, he was very pretty too.

Lady Burl. (*colouring and taking snuff*). I can't think Your Majesty does Chiswick any great honour by the comparison. He was very well for once, like a party to Vauxhall, where the glare and the bustle entertain one for a little while, but one was always tired of one as well as t'other in half an hour.

Queen. Oh! oh! I beg your pardon. I wish all the Vauxhalls were like him, I assure you—I would divert myself exceedingly with Vauxhall; and for your half-hour, I am your humble servant; he has entertained me, poor my Lord Hervey, many and many half-hours, I can promise you: but I am sure you thought he laughed at you a little sometimes, as well as Chiswick. Come, own the truth.

Lady Burl. I never thought enough about him to think whether he did or did not; but I suppose we had all our share.

Lady Sund. I must say I never in my life heard my Lord Hervey make or give into any joke upon people that he professed living at all well with. He would say a lively thing sometimes, to be sure, upon people he was indifferent to, and very bitter ones upon people he was not indifferent to; and I believe we are all glad enough to do that when we have a fair opportunity; the only difference amongst us is, who does it best and worst.

Princess Em. [*to LADY SUNDON*]. Did you really love him? (*Laughs, and mutters something in German to the Queen.*)

Lady Sund. I had a great deal of reason, for he was always very particularly civil and kind to me.

Lady Burl. If he was very civil to you, it was being very particular to you, that's certain. 1736

Queen. I beg your pardon, he was very well bred.

Lady Burl. Where it was his interest, perhaps; he was very well bred to Your Majesty, I dare say.

Lady Sund. I am sure he loved the Queen.

Princess Em. That is, you are sure he said so, my good Lady Sundon, and so will all Mama's pages and gentlemen ushers.

Lady Sund. But he has said it in a way that I think I could see whether he felt what he said or not: he has often said that the Queen had a thousand good and agreeable and amiable qualities that one should like in a private person, and that he could not conceive why those qualities were not to be loved because they were in a Queen—and one felt the justness of that way of thinking; and I assure Your Royal Highness I think the Queen will have a very great loss of him, for, besides the use he was of in Parliament, which I do not pretend to be a judge of, he was certainly a constant amusement to the Queen in private, and gave up his whole time to amuse her; and I must say I do not think it is everybody (if they would give their whole time to it) is capable of amusing the Queen.

Queen. Oh! upon my word he amused me exceedingly. I pray give me the basin to wash. (*LADY PEMBROKE kneels and gives the basin.*) I am afraid, my good Lady Pembroke, you hurt your belly, and really after so many miscarriages you should take care of your belly. There is no jesting with a belly in your condition.

Princess Em. When did your belly miscarry last, Lady Pembroke?

Lady Pem. Last time I was ill Dr. Douglas said he was not sure whether I miscarried or not and Mr. Mordaunt was so uneasy about it that I chose rather to say and to think that I did not miscarry.

Lady Burl. You might say what you pleased, but I don't see how you could think what you pleased about it.

Lady Pem. I don't know; one flatters oneself, you know, and then Mr. Mordaunt was out of his wits about it.

Lady Burl. But you must be out of your wits too, not to know whether you miscarried or not.

Queen. I beg pardon; when one is not used to those things one very easily mistakes, and I believe, Mam, when you was married to my Lord Pembroke you was not so much used to those things. This is come upon you since. I think with him you only miscarried once at first. Oh! poor my Lord Pembroke; he was the best man in this world, and loved you prodigiously.

1736 *Lady Pem.* I believe there was nothing in the world he would not have done for me that he could, and there was nothing in the world I would not have done to help him, but there is no making people young again.

Queen. Oh! I am sure you would help him in any way you could. I must say my Lady Pembroke was the best wife in the world, and you will be, I am sure, as good a wife to Mr. Mordaunt.

Lady Pem. I am sure I should deserve to be hanged if I was not, for he is the best husband in the world. In all my illness I could never persuade him to lie one night from me; and yet very often for whole nights I have been so restless that he has not been able to close his eyes. When first we went to Bath, I don't believe he slept two hours together all the first month. I really thought he would have been very ill himself; he did fall away prodigiously. But before I was married he used to nurse me almost as much as he did afterwards; indeed it was that prodigious good nature that made me marry him; for in so young a man showing so much compassion and good nature to be sure is very engaging.

Enter LORD GRANTHAM.

Queen. Oh! my God! there is my Lord Grantham just come from Scarborough. How do you do, my good Lord Grantham? How does your vapours, and how does Mr. Clarke?¹ I am prodigious glad to see you again, my good Lord Grantham.

Lord Grantham. I am sure as I am glad to see Your Majesty; for when I am not with Your Majesty I am always as de goose out of de water.

Lady Burl. Then now your Lordship is like the goose in the water.

Queen. And so he is: I know nobody can swim better in a Court than my Lord Grantham.

Lady Sund. And it is not in Court-waters as in other waters, where the lightest things swim best.

Queen. They must not be too heavy neither. But what news do you bring us, my Lord Grantham?

Lord Grant. Your Majesty has hear de news of poor my Lord Hervey?

Queen. Ah! mon cher my Lord, c'est une viellerie; ■ y a cent ans qu'on le sçait.

¹Mr. Clarke was a constant companion of Lord Grantham, but what else he was I know not.—*Croker.*

Lord Grant. I have just been talking of him ■ Sir Robert. Sir Robert is prodigiously concerned; he has seen Monsieur—how you call—Maraut. 1736

Queen. Maran, vous voudrez dire. I must ask Sir Robert a little what that poltroon, Mr. Maraut, as you call him, says of his Lord. I pray, my good child, take away all these things, and let Sir Robert come in.

LORD GRANTHAM brings in SIR ROBERT WALPOLE, and all but SIR ROBERT and the QUEEN go out.

Queen. Come, come, my good Sir Robert, sit down. Well, how go matters?

Sir Rob. Everything very well, Madam, pure and well. I have just had intelligence out of the City—all is very quiet there.

Queen. But we must hang some of these villains.

Sir Rob. We will if we can, Madam. I had my Lord Chancellor and my Lord Hardwicke with me this morning, and I told them the circumstances of the fellows we had taken.

Queen. I must do my Lord Chancellor and my Lord Hardwicke justice. They have behaved both exceeding well; exceeding well, upon my word. I am sure they will hang these rogues.

Sir Rob. I told my Lord Chancellor, Madam, that these fellows that the soldiers had seized were some of the most clamorous and most audacious, that they were halloaing in a very tumultuous manner at the head of the mob, and crying, "Come on! come on!" and all that kind of stuff.

Queen. And what did he say? I am sure he was very zealous. He is the best man in the world.

Sir Rob. Madam, after hearing my story out, he paused some time, and seemed to decline giving any opinion at all; at last he asked, and very significantly, whether the hour given by the Riot Act for the dispersing of the mob was expired before the men we proposed trying were taken.

Queen. My God! that is always those silly lawyers' way, as if the soldiers were to go against people in rebellion with watches in their pockets, or to be asking what is o'clock when they should be serving their Prince. And what said my Lord Hardwicke?

Sir Rob. He said too, Madam, that it was impossible to condemn these fellows upon the Riot Act unless the hour was expired.

Queen. Ah! my God! they are all so ennuyant with their silly forms and their silly Acts. But what did he say about pulling down and disfacing—how do you call it?—the houses.

1736 *Sir Rob.* He said on that too, Madam, that unless it could be proved that the men we have taken assisted in the defacing the houses that their being in company with those that did was not capital; for though in murder all present are deemed principals, yet in this law, none were deemed criminal but those who were proved accessory.

Queen. There is your fine English liberty! The canaille may come and pull one by the nose, and unless one can prove which finger touched one's nose, one has but to put a plaster to one's nose, and wait to punish them till they pull it again; and then, may be, they shall pull one's eyes out of one's head, too.

Sir Rob. I am afraid, Madam, there are inconveniences and imperfections attending all systems of government, and these are ours; but we will see what's to be done, and if they are to be come at they shan't escape. But what news from Hanover, Madam?

Queen. There is a letter of five-and-forty pages I have received from the King; I have not time now, but there are some things in it I must talk to you about.

Sir Rob. I have had a long letter, too, from Horace.

Queen. Oh! my God! not about his silly ladder-story again. My good Sir Robert, I am so tired and so sick of all that nonsense that I cannot bear to talk or hear of it any more. A propos—poor my Lord Hervey, I swear I could cry!

Sir Rob. Your Majesty knows I had a great partiality for him; and really, Madam, whatever faults he might have, there was a great deal of good stuff in him: I shall want him, and Your Majesty will miss him.

Queen. Oh! so I shall; and that fiddle-faddle Duke of Newcastle I am sure will be glad; but if he or his sleepy friend the Duke of Grafton come with any of their silly raillery about him, upon my word I will give them their own. Adieu, my good Sir Robert, I believe it is late—I must go a moment into the drawing-room; do you know who is there?

Sir Rob. I saw the Duke of Argyll, Madam.

Queen. Oh! my God! I am so weary of that Felt-marshal, and his tottering head and his silly stories about the Bishops, that I could cry whenever I am obliged to entertain him. And who is there more?

Sir Rob. There is my Lord President, Madam.

Queen. Oh! that's very well; I shall talk to him about his fruit, and some silly council at the Cock-pit, and the Plantations:¹ my Lord President loves the Plantations.

¹The business of the Colonies at the Privy Council which sat at what was called the Cock-pit.

Sir Rob. He had plantations of his own for several years together, 1736
Madam, in Leicester Fields, but Your Majesty would not let them
grow.¹

Queen. He was, poor man, just the reverse of those people in the
Gospel who reaped where they had not sowed, for my good Lord
President sowed where he did not reap. But who is there beside?

Sir Rob. There is my tottering Lord Harrington.

Queen. Oh! my God! I wish he tottered till he fell quite down,
that I might not have the fatigue of being obliged to entertain him.
The slowness of that drone is a fatigue to me that is inexpressible: he
must have six hours in the morning for his chocolate and his toilet,
and the newspapers; six hours more for his dinner; six hours more
for his nasty guenipes and for supper; and six more for sleep; and
there is the twenty-four very well disposed: and if ever he gives by
chance six hours to his business, it is for what might be done in six
minutes, and should have been done six days before.

Sir Rob. Ha! ha! ha! Poor Harrington! I wonder he need take
six hours to dress, when Your Majesty shows you can dress him in
six minutes with six words.

Queen. Adieu, adieu, my good Sir Robert; I must go, though you
are to-day excellent conversation.

ACT III

*Scene changes to the great Drawing Room—all the Courtiers ranged
in a circle.*

*Enter the QUEEN, led by LORD GRANTHAM, followed by the PRIN-
CESSES and all her Train. [QUEEN curtsies slightly; Drawing
Room bows and curtsies very low.]*

Queen [to the DUKE OF ARGYLL]. Where have been, my Lord?
One has not had the pleasure to see you a great while; and one
always misses you.

Duke of Argyll. I have been in Oxfordshire, Madam; and so long,
that I was asking my father here, Lord Selkirk, how to behave: I
know nobody that knows the ways of a Court so well, nor that has
known them so long.

Lord Selkirk. By God! my Lord, I know nobody knows them
better than the Duke of Argyll.

¹Leicester House, i.e. paying court to George II. as Prince of Wales.

1736 *Duke of Arg.* All I know, father, is as your pupil; but I told you I was grown a country gentleman.

Lord Selk. You often tell me things I do not believe.

Queen [laughing]. Ha! ha! ha! You are always so good together, and my Lord Selkirk is so lively. [Turning ■ **LORD PRESIDENT.**] I think, my Lord, you are a little of a country gentleman too—you love Chiswick mightily; you have very good fruit there, and are very curious in it; you have very good plums.

Lord President. I like a plum, Madam, mightily—it is a very pretty fruit.

Queen. The green-gage, I think, is very good.

Lord Pres. There are three of that sort, Madam—there is the true green-gage, and there is the Drap-d'or that has yellow spots, and there is the Reine Claude that has red spots.

Queen. Ah! ah! One sees you are very curious, and that you understand these things perfectly well: upon my word, I did not know you was so deep in these things—you know the plums, as Solomon did the plants, from the cedar to the hyssop.

Queen [to the first Court Lady]. I believe you found it very dusty.

First Court Lady. Very dusty, ■adam.

Queen [to the second Court Lady]. Do you go soon into the country, Madam!

Second Court Lady. Very soon, Madam.

Queen [to the third Court Lady]. The town is very empty, I believe, Madam?

Third Court Lady. Very empty, Madam.

Queen [to the fourth Court Lady]. I hope all your family is very well, Madam.

Fourth Court Lady. Very well, Madam.

Queen [to the fifth Court Lady]. We have had the finest summer for walking in the world.

Fifth Court Lady. Very fine, Madam.

Queen [to the **DUCHESS OF HAMILTON**]. One cannot help wishing you joy, Madam, every time one sees you, of the good matches your daughters have made.

*Duchess of Hamilton.*¹ Considering how they behaved, I wonder indeed they had any matches at all; but for any other two women of quality, one should think it no great catch for one to be married to a fool and t'other to a beggar.

¹Elizabeth, daughter and heiress of Lord Gerard. She died in 1744, aged 63, having had seven children. Her eldest daughter, Lady Charlotte Hamilton, married, 1st May, 1736, Charles Edwin, Esq., and Lady Susan,

Queen. Oh fie, fie! my good Duchess! One cannot help laughing, 1736
you are so lively; but your expressions are very strong.

Queen [to the DUCHESS OF RUTLAND¹]. Come, come, my good Duchess, one is always glad to see you.

Duchess of Rutland. Your Majesty is always very kind to an old woman and a poor widow, that you are so good to let torment you about her children: and, Madam, I must beg Your Majesty—
[whispers to the Queen].

Princess Caroline [at the other end of the room, to the DUKE OF GRAFTON]. I vow I think it is very brutal to laugh at such things.

Duke of Grafton. Dans ce monde, il faut—il faut—il faut—se consoler dans tous les malheurs. [To the DUKE OF NEWCASTLE.] Have you cried for my Lord Hervey? Princess Caroline says one should—one should—shed a little tear for my Lord Hervey.

Princess Car. I say no such thing. I said there was not de quoi rire for anybody; and that, for my own part, I am very sorry; and that he used to entertain me very often.

Duke of Graft. Well, I knew people used to say—and that—of his wit; but, upon my word, it may be, perhaps—you know everybody does not—just alike, and so—in those things—or may be, when I saw him—but I swear then—entertaining and all that—why now, Madame la Princesse, it did not, I own, strike me; and there was something—I don't know how to say it—but, in short, you know what I mean.

Princess Emily. Well, I swear I think now the Duke of Grafton is in the right: to be sure there was a vivacity, and a great many words, and all that—mais je vous jure que le tout ensemble ne me plaisoit pas.

Duke of Newcastle [picking his nose, his ears, his teeth, and his backside, one after another]. Well said, Madame la Princesse! I think the Princess Emily has hit that off well: there was, to be sure, things in him, but altogether it did not do well; at least, it did not please me: and there was something, I don't know how to describe it, and perhaps I may be told I am prejudiced, and therefore—

Duke of Graft. Why now there is Chesterfield—I don't love Chesterfield—but then my Lord Chesterfield has—has—my Lord Chesterfield has certainly wit—and that—

Anthony Tracy Keck, Esq., 16th August of the same year. The former was the “fool” and the latter the “beggar.”—*Croker.*

¹Lucy Bennett, sister of the first Lord Harborough, widow of the second Duke of Rutland, who died in 1721, leaving her six sons and two daughters.
—*Croker.*

1736 *Duke of Newc.* Well, I think Chesterfield has ten times more wit than my Lord Hervey; and in the House of Lords, though Sir Robert, you know, is partial to one and against the other, in my opinion there is no comparison.

Queen [*comes up to the DUKES OF GRAFTON and NEWCASTLE.*] You are talking of poor my Lord Hervey, I believe; well, I am sure now the Duke of Grafton is very sorry, for au fond the Duke of de Grafton ■ not what one calls hard—*je l'ai toujours dit.*

Duke of Graft. Your Majesty will want him by your chaise a hunting—oh! no—I think he did not hunt of late.

Queen. No, my Lord, he did not hunt; but though he did not love nor understand hunting so well as votre Grace, there are many occasions in which I shall want him very much; the King will want him too. Do you not think so, Duke of Newcastle?

Duke of Newc. I think the King can't want a Vice-Chamberlain; I dare say His Majesty will find people enough will be glad of the office.

Queen. I must say, my good Duke of Newcastle, this is une très platte réponse—to be sure, the King will find Vice-Chamberlains enough, though my Lord Hervey is dead; as he would find Secretaries of State enough, if we had the misfortune to lose our good friend Permis;¹ but I dare say he would never find such another——

Duke of Newc. As which?

Queen. Just as you please; I leave it with you.

Enter LORD GRANTHAM in a hurry.

Lord Grantham. Ah! dere is my Lord Hervey in Your Majesty gallery; he is in de frock and de bob, or he should have come in.

Queen. My God! My Lord Grantham, you are mad!

Lord Grants. He is dere, all so live as he was; and has play de trick to see as we should all say.

Queen. Then he is mad—allons voir qu'est ce que c'est que tout ceci. [*Exeunt omnes.*]

¹The Duke's nickname in the Royal Family, from his habit of prefacing his remarks to them with "Est-il permis?"

The Queen's temper and patience under the King's neglect held out tolerably well till it came to be sure that his stay at Hanover would be protracted beyond his birthday. But this being a mark of his indifference to her, and the strength of his attachment to another, with which she had never before been mortified, she began to deviate a little from the general resolution she before seemed to have taken, of submitting to every slight her husband thought fit to put upon her, not only without resenting or murmuring, but even without seeming to feel or see it. She began to slacken in her assiduity towards His Majesty in her letters and the length of them; the thirty or forty pages, which used to be their usual length, were shrunk to seven or eight; and it is probable that the style (though this is only conjecture) abated as much of its cordiality as the bulk of its quantity. Lord Hervey had observed these alterations and disapproved them; but as the Queen had always spoken of this amour of the King's with Madame Walmoden as a thing she despised, and that Lord Hervey back again had talked of it as a thing below her regard, and often turned every circumstance of it into ridicule, his Lordship did not now care to risk the taking it on a more serious tone, or to seem to observe that Her Majesty had done so, when she had not thought fit to give the least hint of this alteration either in her way of acting or thinking; nor was there perhaps any in the latter, though there was in the former.

However, as he apprehended such a change would weaken her interest yet more with the King rather than retrieve it, Lord Hervey told Sir Robert Walpole what he had remarked, and begged him somehow or other to prevent her going on in a way that would certainly destroy her. Sir Robert Walpole said nothing could ever quite destroy her power with the King, though several

1736 things might happen temporarily to weaken her influence or to make the exercise of it more difficult. Lord Hervey replied that he knew but two ways any woman had of keeping her power with any man, which were by the man's fondness for her person or by habit; that, as to the first, it was very plain that cement no longer subsisted to unite the King and Queen; and that, for the other, these frequent absences, he feared, would bring habit to operate with no more force than inclination, especially when the King found whenever he broke into this habit of being with his wife, it was for his pleasure, and whenever he returned to it, that it proved for his mortification. Sir Robert Walpole allowed all this to be very true, but insisted still that the Queen had by a long course of years, and by the King's opinion of her understanding, as well as security in her truth to him, got such an ascendant over His Majesty's mind that it was impossible for anything to dissolve it. However, he said he was entirely of Lord Hervey's opinion that her taking the *fière* turn would hurt her, and that he had observed she was going into that method before Lord Hervey had told him of it; that he had already spoken slightly on the subject to the Queen, and resolved, if he saw hints had no effect, to give her his opinion more plainly. Accordingly he did so, and gave Lord Hervey, some time after, an account of what had passed between him and the Queen on this subject. He said he had told Her Majesty that if he had a mind to flatter her into her ruin, he might talk to her as if she was now five-and-twenty years old, and try to make her imagine that to alarm the King with apprehensions of losing her affection might awaken his fear and bring him back. But as this was not the case, he said he should be unpardonable if, in order to talk in a style that might please her, he should give her counsel that would ruin her. He said it was too late in her life to try new methods, and that she must never hope now to keep her power with the King by reversing those methods by which she had gained it;

that nothing but soothing, complying, softening, bending, 1736
and submitting, could do any good; but that she must
persist in those arts, must press the King to bring this
woman to England; and that if Her Majesty would do
this, trust to him, and take his advice, he would engage
she should get the better of her. He taught her this hard
lesson till she wept; and Her Majesty, instead of reproach-
ing him for the liberty he had taken, promised to do
everything he had desired her, and thanked him for the
friendship he had shown towards her. When Sir Robert
Walpole related this passage to Lord Hervey, he added:
"My Lord, she laid her thanks on so thick, and made such
professions of friendship and gratitude, that I found I had
gone too far; for I am never so much afraid of her rebukes
as her commendations. I know how to justify myself
against the first, but not against the latter, as I know them
often to be false, and dare not receive them but as if I
thought they were true."

However, Sir Robert Walpole did not disguise his
suspicions so well but that the Queen perceived them;
for, two or three days afterwards, walking with Sir
Robert Walpole in her gardens at Richmond, where she
passed every Saturday all this summer, she told him: "I
saw you did not believe me the other day, nor imagine,
though I promised to take your advice, that I intended
to keep my word; own the truth, am I not in the right?"
Sir Robert Walpole (who was certainly a very ill-bred man),
yet by the force of his understanding, made an answer
to this question that if one had known no other stroke
of his character in point of breeding, one should have
concluded him as polite a courtier as dexterous statesman.
"Madam (said he), Your Majesty, in asking if I disbe-
lieved you, would put a word into my mouth so coarse
that I could not even give it place in my thoughts; but,
if you oblige me to answer this question, I confess I
feared." "Well," replied the Queen, "I understand what
'I feared' means upon this occasion; but to show you

1736 your fears are ill-founded I have considered what you said to me, and am determined this very day to write to the King just as you would have me; and on Monday, when we meet at Kensington, you shall see the letter." Accordingly, a most submissive, kind, and tender letter was written by Her Majesty to the King, assuring him she had nothing but his interest and his pleasure at heart; that she had long known such was her duty, and that she hoped he had long known such was her practice; that she hoped the uninterrupted series of her conduct ever since he had known her would make his recollection convince him of this truth more fully than all she could say; and the letter ended with making it her earnest request to the King that he would bring Madame Walmoden to England, and giving him repeated assurances that his wife's conduct to his mistress should be everything he desired when he told his pleasure, and everything she imagined he wished when she was left to guess it.

The Queen never showed Lord Hervey this letter, nor ever gave him the least hint of her having written one to this effect further than always agreeing with him when he said he wished this new favourite to be brought over; and frequently, when he talked to her on this subject, she would begin to sing or repeat these words: "*Se mai più sarò gelosa mi punisca il sacro nume,*" etc., which was the beginning of a song in one of Handel's operas called *Porus*: and always spoke of these conjugal infidelities as things about which only girls and fools ever made themselves uneasy; acknowledging at the same time, as she knew the discontent the King's annual journeys to Hanover created here, that there was nothing she wished so much as that he would bring Madame Walmoden over. She would often say at the same time how much she had wished to keep Lady Suffolk at Court, and though the generality of the world, who always made false judgments on these occasions for want of seeing *le dessous des cartes*, had imagined Lady Suffolk's disgrace was the effect of

Her Majesty's intrigues and a proof of her influence over 1736
the King, that it was so much the contrary that she had
done all she could to persuade her to stay in that audience
Lady Suffolk asked of her; and that when she told the
King she had done so, the King snubbed her for it,
and said: "What the devil did you mean by trying to
make an old, dull, deaf, peevish beast stay and plague
me when I had so good an opportunity of getting rid
of her."

But notwithstanding all the reasonable things the Queen
could say on these two subjects, of having formerly
desired to keep Lady Suffolk at St. James's, and now
desiring to bring Madame Walmoden thither, she neither
felt all she said, nor was willing even in her own mind to
reflect on all she felt, but often deceived even herself
as well as others, and (from wishing she could think as
her pride and her interest would dictate to her) would
not permit herself to see that the wife in her breast
was perpetually combating the Queen, and the woman
revolting against the politician.

When Sir Robert Walpole told Lord Hervey of this
letter that the Queen had written to the King to solicit
his bringing Madame Walmoden over, he gave the manner
of cooking it the greatest encomiums in which it was
possible to speak of such a performance; he said she had
not pared away the least part of his meaning, but had
clothed his sentiments in so pretty a dress, had mixed so
many tender turns in every paragraph, and spoke with
such decent concern of her own situation as well as con-
sideration of the King's, had covered all her own passions
so artfully, and applied so pathetically to his, that Sir
Robert Walpole said he did not believe anybody but a
woman could have written a letter of that sort, nor any
woman but the Queen so good a one.

Lord Hervey said he was quite satisfied with this
report of the letter; and had only one question more to
ask, which was, if Sir Robert thought the letter went?

1736 Sir Robert said he really believed it did; for though upon his first reading it he thought it was so good that it was never designed to go, yet the Queen's whole behaviour that morning had such an air of openness and sincerity that he really believed the letter would be sent that night to Hanover. "Her behaviour was very different this morning," continued he, "from what it was when first I spoke to her on this subject. She acknowledged I had before made her half angry with me; and the anger she owns is never dangerous; it is only her commendations alarm me, for whenever she daubs I fear.

"But this day," continued Sir Robert, "she went even further than I desired, by telling me she intended to make the King the offer of taking Madame Walmoden into her service, which I advised her against, telling her if the King should accept that offer it could have no good air in the world, as it must either draw contempt upon her from being thought too mean a condescension in her if it should be judged merely her own doing, or would bring an odium upon the King if it should be concluded that Madame Walmoden had been forced upon her." The Queen then gave the example of Lady Suffolk's situation, which had made no clamour at all of this kind; to which Sir Robert Walpole replied that he could not help thinking the world would judge very differently of the two cases, as the King's making one of the Queen's servants his mistress, or his mistress one of the Queen's servants, were two things which nobody would see in the same light.

Soon after all apprehensions of this letter not having been sent were totally dissipated, for an answer to it came from the King, which the Queen showed to Sir Robert Walpole. This letter wanted no marks of kindness but those that men express to women they love; had it been written to a man, nothing could have been added to strengthen its tenderness, friendship, and affection. He extolled the Queen's merit towards him in the strongest

expression of his sense of all her goodness to him and the 1736 gratitude he felt towards her. He commended her understanding, her temper, and in short left nothing unsaid that could demonstrate the opinion he had of her head and the value he set upon her heart. He told her too she knew him to be just in his nature, and how much he wished he could be everything she would have him. "Mais vous voyez mes passions, ma chère Caroline! Vous connaissez mes foiblesses, il n'y a rien de caché dans mon cœur pour vous, et plutôt à Dieu que vous pourriez me corriger avec la même facilité que vous m'approfondissez! Plut à Dieu que je pourrais vous imiter autant que je sais vous admirer, et que je pourrais apprendre de vous toutes les vertus que vous me faites voir, sentir, et aimer!" His Majesty then came to the point of Madame Walmoden's coming to England, and said she told him she would do anything he would have her, that she relied on the Queen's goodness, and would give herself up to whatever Their Majesties thought fit, and to be disposed of implicitly as they should direct. Sir Robert Walpole, who gave Lord Hervey an account of this letter merely by memory (but said he had read it several times), assured Lord Hervey it was so well written, that if the King was only to write to women, and never to strut and talk to them, he believed His Majesty would get the better of all the men in the world with them.

The King in this letter gave a full description to the Queen of Madame Walmoden's person, understanding, and temper. He said she was far from being a regular beauty, but had a very agreeable countenance; was rather genteelly than exactly made. "Qu'elle n'avait pas un esprit éclatant, mais enjoué et amusant; mais à l'égard du cœur elle est sûrement la meilleure créature du monde." This was the conclusion of her corporal and mental picture. In this letter, too, the King having desired the Queen to prepare Lady Suffolk's lodgings for Madame Walmoden, Her Majesty, when she had shown the letter

1736 to Sir Robert, said, "Well now, Sir Robert, I hope you are satisfied. You see this *mignonne* is coming to England." Upon which Sir Robert shook his head. "What do you mean by that?" said the Queen. "I mean," said Sir Robert, "that Your Majesty is not pleased with me when you think she is coming, and that you imagine by this letter that she will do what she no more designs than you wish. Madam, it is very plain to me that she won't come, and that—I wish I could speak Latin to you—I would tell Your Majesty that when the King assured her she might depend on Your Majesty's goodness to her, I believe her answer was—*sic notus Ulysses?*" "Pray, explain that to me," replied the Queen. "The explanation, Madam," said Sir Robert, "is that she has had a character of Your Majesty only from your enemies; that she mistrusts when she pretends to confide, that she fears your goodness when she says she relies upon it, and never intends to trust to what—I soften her thoughts when I only say—she doubts. I must add too, Madam, though the King tells you more than I believe any man from the beginning of the world ever told his wife of his mistress, yet depend upon it he does not tell you all, and there are some things pass between them—as communicative as you think him and as he really is—unreported. However, Madam, get him here and be ruled by me. We will notwithstanding all this bring her here and humble her too. Lord Hervey said to me the other day, in speaking of the subject, 'If you can but once get this favourite to St. James's she will in three months be everything Lady Suffolk was, but deaf;' and it is really, Madam, the true state of the case, and your only option is whether you will fear her at a distance or despise her near." "Well," said the Queen, "we shall soon see; for I have this very day wrote the King word that I will get Lady Suffolk's lodgings ready immediately, and enlarge them by adding the two rooms where my books now are which join to Lady Suffolk's lodgings, and I will hire some rooms for my books in the meantime till my

library that is building¹ in the Park shall be fit to receive 1736 them."

When Sir Robert Walpole told all this again to Lord Hervey, he added that it was those bitches Lady Pomfret and Lady Sundon, who were always bemoaning the Queen on this occasion, and making their court by saying they hoped never to see this saucy whore brought under Her Majesty's nose here, who made it so difficult to bring the Queen to do what was right and sensible for her to do.

Lord Hervey did not say he guessed who had told him this, but was as sure as if he had heard her that it was Mrs. Selwyn, a Bedchamber Woman of the Queen, and the only woman about the Court who loved Sir Robert Walpole, as he himself knew and often would say. Mrs. Selwyn was a simple cunning woman, who hated Lady Sundon, and to make her court to Sir Robert had told him this story. Lord Hervey, who really loved Lady Sundon, and looked upon her as a woman deserving to be loved and esteemed, as she had very great, good, and noble qualities, said he firmly believed Sir Robert was as much mistaken about Lady Sundon as about Lady Pomfret; for as to the latter, the Queen, he was sure, never permitted her to talk on these subjects to her at all; and as to Lady Sundon she was certainly no fool, and had been long enough about the Queen to know that nobody could make their court so ill as those who affected pitying her; neither did he imagine Lady Sundon judged so ill of the Queen's interest as to think it better for her that Madame Walmoden should continue where she was, beckoning the King every summer to Hanover, to risk his life and irritate his subjects. "My Lord," says Sir Robert, "you have a sneaking kindness for Lady Sundon, and therefore pretend to think better of her than you do, or than she deserves; but as to what I have now told you, I know it to be true—I say I know it—and at the same time I know

¹In the Green Park, on the site of Stafford House, now the London Museum.

1736 too she has given hints, as if I wished to bring this woman over only to play the wife upon the mistress and the mistress upon the wife, as my own interest should occasionally prompt me, without caring a farthing what became of either, provided I could keep my power; and what I now tell you, you may depend upon I know to be truth." His peremptory repetition of his knowing all this to be true, obliged Lord Hervey in common decency and good breeding to give up the dispute, but did not make him alter his opinion. "A propos," said Lord Hervey, "to playing the mistress and the wife upon one another, has the report so current about town of your brother's having made a great feast at Hanover on Madame Walmoden's birthday any foundation?" Sir Robert Walpole said that his brother's conduct was so different from what was insinuated by a report of this kind, that he was very confident nothing had ever passed between him and Madame Walmoden that looked as if he knew she was the King's mistress, and that Horace thought himself so much in the Queen's favour that he was sure if anybody was to ask him who had the best interest with the Queen of the two brothers, Horace would answer himself. Sir Robert's jealousy of anybody pretending to have interest with the Queen but himself never appeared so strongly as on this occasion, for he could not help saying what I have repeated even of his own brother without at the same time showing such a dislike as surprised Lord Hervey a good deal, considering the situation of Horace, but alarmed him much more considering his own.

A little while after this conversation Lord Hervey, having a mind to be satisfied whether he was in the right in his opinion of Lady Sundon's never having spoken to the Queen against Madame Walmoden's coming to England, talked with her upon the subject, told her how right he thought it, and asked her opinion about it; but before he began the conversation insisted on Lady Sundon giving her honour she would never give the least hint to

anybody whatever that he had ever asked her this question, or spoken to her upon this chapter; and Lady Sundon was one of the few courtiers whose honour, so solemnly given, Lord Hervey would have thought any security on such an occasion. Lady Sundon assured Lord Hervey that directly nor indirectly she had never mentioned this to the Queen in her life, nor heard the Queen speak upon the subject; that as to her private opinion, as she was no Minister, she would wish Madame Walmoden here; for that she foresaw nobody but a Minister that would be distressed by her being here. Lord Hervey then asked if she had never talked of this to any other lady. Lady Sundon assured him she had always avoided not only talking but hearing anything relating to Madame Walmoden; and added that Mrs. Selwyn the other day in the Queen's antechamber, where they were together alone, had quite astonished her by the free manner in which she had spoke of these things; "but favourites you know, my Lord, may venture anything." "She told me," continued Lady Sundon, "that she believed if the King should go again next summer to Hanover, it would be for good and all, for that the people would be so exasperated they would never let him come back." "To which," said Lady Sundon, "I replied as cautiously as I could (for I know Madam Selwyn), to be sure the disposition of the people towards the King was not so good as one wished it, but I hoped it was not as bad neither as she seemed to apprehend it." Mrs. Selwyn (Lady Sundon said) then asked her whether she did not think it would be better to have Madame Walmoden in England? To which she replied she believed there would be difficulties both ways. "And this," said Lady Sundon, "is all I would say, though she tried to make me more open, and would really have distressed me had not Lord Grantham come into the room, whom for the first time in my life I was glad to see."

This was enough to convince Lord Hervey that he had conjectured well; and though Sir Robert Walpole several

1736 times after spoke to him of Lady Sundon's talking in this strain to the Queen, Lord Hervey only said (as he had done at first), without letting Sir Robert know he had ever spoken to Lady Sundon about it, that he did not think it probable; and would venture his head that the Queen had never let anybody but Sir Robert and himself talk to her on the chapter of Madame Walmoden at all. Lord Hervey, by way of softening his flat contradiction of Sir Robert in this fact, added: "If you, Sir, had told me anything that you had seen or heard, perhaps I might believe one of your senses against my own five; but as you had this from intelligence, you will give me leave to say I think my observation on this point as good as theirs; and I'll be hanged if 'tis true." Sir Robert said: "Ask the Queen; I do not believe she will deny it." Lord Hervey, who knew Sir Robert's reason for bidding him ask the Queen, replied: "You and I, Sir, are well enough acquainted with the Queen to know that when she lets a sentiment escape her which she is ashamed of, that she had rather one should think it was planted in her, than that it grew there; and though she would not lay it upon anybody herself, she will suffer you uncontradicted to lay it on whom you please, provided you take it off her. But, believe me, the greatest obstacle in this kingdom to Madame Walmoden's coming here is the Queen's own heart, that recoils whenever her head proposes it."

In October the King wrote to the Queen to desire her to remove from Kensington to London, saying the season of the year being so far advanced, and that house where she was having the reputation of being damp, he fancied the Queen would find it better for her health, as well as easier to the Ministers that were to attend her,¹ to go now

¹Croker quotes, in illustration of this passage, from a letter of Lord Hervey's to his mother, dated 27th Nov. 1736: "The road between this place [Kensington] and London is grown so infamously bad, that we live here in the same solitude as we should do if cast on a rock in the middle of the ocean, and all the Londoners tell us there is between them and us a great

and settle for the winter at St. James's; but as the Queen 1736 understood this to be an offer which he thought himself obliged to make, and one which he had rather she did not accept, Her Majesty determined to stay at Kensington till the King should set out from Hanover, and only go to London time enough to receive him there. She knew the King and his way of thinking thoroughly; and certainly imagined this air of retirement, and her seeming to decline all state and parade during his absence, would be most agreeable to His Majesty; and that her choosing this part when he had pressed her to take the other would make the choice doubly meritorious.

In the meantime the people of all ranks grew every day more discontented at the King's stay in Germany. The people belonging to the Court were uneasy at it, as it made the Court so much more unpopular; and those who were attached to the Queen were yet more so from the apprehension of these long absences being both the means and the signs of her altered power. The tradesmen were all uneasy, as they thought the King's absence prevented people coming to town, and particularly for the birthday; the citizens made this preference he seemed to give to his German dominions a pretence to show their disaffection, but were before so thoroughly disaffected that it made no great addition to what they felt, though it opened the sluices of their clamorous mouths. The ordinary and the godly people took the turn of pitying the poor Queen, and railing at His Majesty for using so good a wife, who had brought him so many fine children, so abominably ill. Some of them (and those who, if he had heard all this, would have fretted him most) used to talk of his age, and say, for a man at his time of day to be playing these youthful pranks, and fancying himself in love, was quite ridiculous, as well as inexcusable. Others,

impassable gulf of mud. There are two roads through the park, but the new one is so convex and the old one so concave, that by this extreme of faults they agree in the common one of being, like the high road, impassable."

1736 in very coarse terms, would ask if he must have a mistress whether England could furnish never a one good enough to serve his turn; and if he thought Parliament had given him a greater civil-list than any of his predecessors only to defray the extraordinary expenses of his travelling charges, to support his Hanover bawdy-houses in magnificence, and enrich his German pimps and whores.

To this familiar manner of talking were added several little ingenious manuscripts. Pasquinades were stuck up in several quarters of the town, and some practical jokes and satires (that no marks of dissatisfaction might be omitted) were likewise exhibited. An old lean, lame, blind horse was turned into the streets, with a broken saddle on his back and a pillion behind it, and on the horses' forehead this inscription was fixed:

"Let nobody stop me—I am the King's Hanover Equipage going to fetch His Majesty and his whore to England."

At the Royal Exchange, a paper with these words was stuck up:

"It is reported that his Hanoverian Majesty designs to visit his British dominions for three months in the spring."

On St. James's gate this advertisement was pasted:

"Lost or strayed out of this house, a man who has left a wife and six children on the parish; whoever will give any tidings of him to the churchwardens of St. James's Parish, so as he may be got again, shall receive four shillings and sixpence reward.

N.B.—This reward will not be increased, nobody judging him to deserve a Crown."

It would be too tedious to enumerate half the things of this nature that were put in practice on this occasion; but Dion Cassius and Suetonius do not inform us of more jokes, verbal or practical, put upon Cæsar on his return to Rome than were exhibited against our Augustus for not returning to England; nor was Nicomedes oftener objected to the one than Madame Walmoden to the other.

But most of these things lost the effect they were designed 1736 to have on the King so much, that instead of mortifying his pride, irritating his wrath, and covering him with shame, many of them only served to flatter his vanity; for as the two characters he most affected were the brave warrior and the tender lover, so he looked on all these satires and lampoons as so many proofs of his eminence in the last of these callings.

When the Queen declared she intended to stay at Kensington till the King came, the Prince, who had a mind to go to London for the same reason that the Queen avoided it—which was because he thought His Majesty would dislike it—told the Queen his expenses at Kensington were so great, and his lodgings there were so damp, that he intended to remove to London, and would fain have drawn her in either to consent to this design or to lay her commands upon him not to put it into execution; but he could bring neither of these things about; she declined both. And for fear His Royal Highness might misreport the conversation, she repeated the substance of it next morning to him in the following letter:

Je suis fâchée, mon cher fils, quand vous me consultez, que je ne puis pas toujours vous donner le conseil qui vous plairait le plus, même dans les bagatelles: mais considérant les ordres que vous avez reçus du Roi, par le Duc de Grafton, il est impossible que je puisse approuver votre dessein d'aller vous établir à Londres pendant que je resterais encore à Kensington. Quant à la proposition que je vous ai faite, que la Dame de la Princesse sera toujours reçue à la table de ma Dame ici, je ne l'aurois jamais faite si je ne m'étois pas souvenue que dans le tems du feu Roi à Hampton Court ma Dame étoit reçue les jours publics, de même, par son ordre, à la table de son gentilhomme de la chambre; et je puis vous assurer, mon cher fils, que comme amie et comme mère, vous me trouverez toujours prête à faire toute chose non seulement pour votre intérêt, mais aussi pour votre plaisir, dans toutes les occasions.

The Prince made no answer in writing immediately to this letter, but told the Queen, when he saw her that day ■ dinner, that as she had not ordered him to send any

1736 answer in writing he did not care to give her the trouble of one; and now again renewed his importunity to desire her to declare her pleasure what he should do, adding, that if she would lay her commands upon him to stay at Kensington, he would certainly obey them. The Queen said she had desired no answer to her letter, because she never insisted upon anything from him merely as point of form, and that as his going or staying was the only subject of her letter, his conduct would be the answer; that as to her pleasure in it, there never could be any exception to the general desire she had for the Prince in **all** things to obey the King; and that for adding her commands upon any occasion to the King's, she could not help thinking it quite unnecessary with regard to the Prince, and not right to the King, to imagine that the addition of her orders could give force to his.

Here ended this conversation; and the next morning the Prince wrote the Queen the following letter:

MADAME,

Après avoir considéré tout ce que votre Majesté m'a dit sur ma proposition d'aller à Londres, j'ai résolu de faire le palais de Kensington, pendant que vous y resterez, mon principal séjour, malgré tous les inconvéniens que j'y trouve; et je me sou mets en cette occasion, non pas de peur des conséquences qui pourroient en arriver si je ne le faisois pas, ni par espérance d'aucun avantage que je pourrois tirer en le faisant, mais par le principe de cette soumission qu'un fils doit à ses parens.

Etant avec beaucoup de respect, Madame,

De votre Majesté, etc.,

FREDERICK.

The copies of these two letters cannot be very exact, as the Queen showed them to me but once; but, as I wrote them down from memory immediately after I came from the Queen, the difference between them and the originals I believe is only verbal, and very minute; for the main substance of them, I am sure, was just as I have given it.

The next time the Queen saw the Prince after his 1736 sending her this letter, she told him it was very well written, and asked him if he had written it himself? The Prince coloured from a mixture of shame and anger, and asked her why she thought him incapable of writing it. She said she did not think him at all incapable of writing everything in it that was well; but that the expression of "un fils à ses parens" was not French, but a translation from English, which had made her imagine it was written by some Englishman.

When she showed Lord Hervey these letters, she asked him who he thought had written His Royal Highness's? Lord Hervey said the Prince was not now well enough with Lord Chesterfield to have consulted him; and, besides that, Lord Chesterfield would have written better French, as well as with more turns and points; that Mr. Lyttelton would have been more verbose; and therefore that he should imagine it was the work of young Pitt, who was now perpetually with the Prince, and at present in the first rank of his favour.

Pursuant to the purport of this letter the Prince made Kensington his *séjour* principal (as he called it) for the rest of the time the Court stayed at Kensington, that is, he left the Princess's maids of honour and some of the under servants constantly there; but the Princess and he seldom lay there above one night or two in the week. She kept her drawing-room and he his levee there constantly every Monday morning; sometimes too they came on a Thursday; but for the rest of the week they were either at Kew or London, and seldom two days together in the same place, which gave the Queen occasion to say to him once, pleasantly enough, that they did not seem to lead the lives of Princes, but gipsies, who generally lie under a different hedge or in a different barn every night. She told me, too, that the King had chid her in his letters for letting them ramble about in that manner, to which she said she had sent the King word that they neither

1736 asked her leave to go out, nor were of an age to be locked up.

The Prince had at this time a great mind to intimate to the people about him that the Princess was breeding. Orders were frequently issued from his own royal mouth to his coachman, as he was stepping into the coach, to drive softly whenever the Princess was with him, and several little hints of the like nature were often thrown out. But a very different opinion of this matter reigned on the Queen's side of the house. Her Majesty did not only doubt of her daughter-in-law's being with child but made it a question whether the Prince's marriage had ever been consummated. She had heard so many stories of different kinds relating to this affair, and even from the Prince's own mouth, who, she said, spoke sometimes of himself in those matters as a Hercules, and at other times as if he was fourscore, that she told Lord Hervey she did not know what to think about it, and begged him seriously to tell her whether he thought the Prince was capable of having a child or not. "As for those of little Vane, you know, my dear Lord, I have a thousand times told you that I was always sure they were yours; and if I had wanted further proof of their being so, your son William whom you so reluctantly brought to me this summer would have convinced me of it, because if he had been twin-brother to little Fitzfrederick, he could not have been more like him. Put all affectation therefore out of the question, look upon me as your friend, and answer me seriously on this point, as one that I am most extremely anxious to be satisfied in."

Lord Hervey said Her Majesty had put this question to him in such a manner that it was impossible for him to decline answering it. "And though there are several things, Madam, that I would refuse speaking upon, yet whenever I do speak, you may depend upon it, it will be without any deceit, and that I will always either say I won't tell or tell the truth. In the first place, then, Your

Majesty must know that the chief intelligence that I can 1736 have had on this subject must have been from Miss Vane, who I do not tell Your Majesty always adhered to truth. She used to describe the Prince in these matters ignorant to a degree inconceivable, but not impotent, and my firm belief is that he is as capable of having children as any man in England."

The Queen said that there was as little dependence to be had on the Prince's truth as Miss Vane's. "For you know," said she, "how apt we are to embroider; but with regard to this particular business, less is to be collected from him than on any other subject. Sometimes he speaks of himself as if he was the late King of Poland, at others with a despondency of having children, and in so pathetic a tone, that he is ready to cry, and seems to think it impossible. The other day he took me aside to tell me in my ear of an operation that was performed upon him by his Surgeon Valet de chambre Vreid, which I was as far from understanding as believing, and begged him to talk of something else, because he only made me sick and ashamed without comprehending what he meant. He has told me that he has often got nasty distempers by women, *dont je ne crois pas un mot.*" Lord Hervey said he did not believe it neither, but supposing he had, that his being able to get those distempers would be no proof of his being able to get children, as he believed Farinelli might have the pox, though he could not have heirs.

The Queen asked Lord Hervey if he could not get some intelligence from Lady Dudley. "You know," said she, "that woman has lain with half the town as well as Fretz and consequently must know whether he is like other men or not." Lord Hervey replied that he did not doubt but that there was one way in his power of knowing all Lady Dudley could tell him; but that his curiosity was not strong enough to make him risk his nose to satisfy it.

The Queen said she was excessively anxious upon this head, and added: "I know his rage to have children is

1736 such that there is nothing he is not capable of to gain the point of the Princess being with child. I know he was so solicitous for the reputation of having a child by Vane that, though you have perjured yourself a thousand times by swearing it was not so, yet I am as sure as if I had heard him do it that he asked you to get one for him—hold your tongue, I will not hear you tell any more lies upon that head." "I am not going," interrupted Lord Hervey, "to speak upon that head, but I beg leave to say, even supposing that to be true, there would sure be a great difference between asking a man to lie with one's mistress and asking him to lie with one's wife; besides, Your Majesty must suppose the Princess in the secret for this project to be brought to bear." "I am sure," replied the Queen, "if you were to undertake it, you could contrive, though I know not how you would go about it, to do it without her knowledge." "Supposing the Prince has ever consummated his marriage with her, I believe I could," said Lord Hervey, "but if he never has, it would be impossible; for though I believe I could contrive to put one man upon her for another, I could not put a man upon her for a woman, and the novelty of a consummator could never pass upon her for the quiet of her former bedfellow."

The Queen said she was sure the Princess looked upon herself to be as much married to the Prince as any woman is married to any man. Lord Hervey said that was not proof of her being so unless she had been married before. "But supposing," replied the Queen, "that he is actually married to her and yet despairs of getting children himself, do you think then you could contrive, if he and you were both willing, without her knowledge to go to bed to her instead of him?" "Nothing so easy," replied Lord Hervey. "My God, how is it possible?" said the Queen. "Why, for a month before and after the time of putting this design in execution I would advise the Prince to go to bed several hours after his wife, and to pretend to get up-

for a flux several times in the night, to perfume himself always with some predominant smell, and by the help of these tricks it would be very easy, not using himself to talk to her in bed, to put the change of any man near his own size upon her that he pleased." "I love you mightily, my dear Lord Hervey," said the Queen, "but if I thought you would get a little Hervey by the Princess of Saxe-Gotha to disinherit my dear William, I could not bear it, nor I do not know, what I should not be capable of doing." "As for me," said Lord Hervey, "Your Majesty must know upon the foot I am with the Prince I am quite out of the question; and to speak seriously my great, good, and amiable Queen, it is impossible you can have any fear on this scene. For what in the Prince's situation could be so contemptible as to make such a request to another? Or what other, all circumstances considered, if the Prince did make the request, would risk complying with it?" "As for Fretz being capable of making the request," replied the Queen, "I believe it as much as I believe myself incapable of assisting him in such a design. He has a notion, no matter how well or ill founded, that if the Princess was to have no children he should have no respect paid him, that it would hurt his reputation as a man and his interest as a prince, that he should be looked upon as nothing, and in short I am sure he had rather die than not have her be with child. Then as to getting anybody to do him this favour, he would give them money enough to make it their interest; and besides that, there are few men who would not find their vanity extremely flattered in placing a child of theirs upon the throne." "As to money," said Lord Hervey, "the risk any man must run from the danger of being discovered, or of being assassinated by the Prince's own contrivance afterward to prevent a discovery, would make it very difficult for anybody to think it their interest for any sum of money the Prince could give them to execute this project; and as to the food it would be to their vanity, vanity feeds but very slightly

1736 when it feeds in private; and this is a diet it could never feed upon in public. Supposing I had had the honour to be born Your Majesty's son,"—"I wish to God you had," interrupted the Queen,—“that is very kind,” replied Lord Hervey, “but supposing I had, does Your Majesty imagine, though I believed any other man than the King my father, that I should ever act as if I believed it; or that filial piety would get so far the better of resentment in my mind that I should not wish the man murdered, whoever gave a hint to me myself of my being his son?” “Au bout du conte,” said the Queen, “I know not what to think, but altogether I know it makes me very uneasy.”

Lord Hervey had several conversations on this subject with the Queen and with the Princess Caroline, who were both so prepossessed with the notion of the Prince's being incapable of having a child of his own, and his being capable of persuading somebody else to get one for him, that there was no possibility of making them change either of these opinions or of curing the fears or removing the suspicions consequential to these two odd points of faith.

Neither the Queen nor Princess Caroline loved the Prince, and yet both of them had by fits a reste of management for his character, which made them, though they were very ready to allow all his bad qualities, mix now and then some good ones, which he had very little pretence to. They used to say that he was not such a fool as one took him for; that he was not wise neither; that he could sometimes be very amusing, though often very *ennuyant*; and that in everything he was made up of such odd contradictions, that he would do the meanest, the lowest, and the dirtiest things about money, and at other times the most generous; that his heart was like his head, both bad and good; and that he very often seemed to have a worse heart than he really had, by being a knave when he thought he was only avoiding the character of being a dupe, and by doing things to people without reflecting enough on what he was doing, to know he was hurting

them so much as he really did. Lord Hervey said that was 1736
an excuse one might make at any time, without a possibility of being disproved, for any action in anybody; but that if he saw anyone of thirty years old picking out people's eyes with a pair of scissors, it would be very difficult for a stander-by to persuade him that the person who was performing that operation thought he was paring their nails. The Queen said that would indeed, she believed, be something difficult; but if, in paring their nails, he only cut into the finger a little, one might sure imagine that wounding the flesh was accident, and that in reality he only thought of cutting their nails too close to scratch him; "and this I firmly believe was sometimes the case. When he betrayed you, laughed at Dodington, and gave up Lord Chesterfield, he was certainly very false to every one of you, one after another; but when he was so, he thought of nothing more than clearing himself of the suspicion one might have of his being weak enough to be governed."

Lord Hervey told the Queen she was the best apologist he knew in the world, but said the consequences of the Prince's conduct were equally prejudicial to His Royal Highness's character, let the motive be what it would; and that it could never be so fatal to any Prince to have it thought he was to be governed as to have it known he was not to be trusted, which was certainly the Prince's case, and said of him by everybody that ever spoke of him, and thought even by many who did not speak of him. "This will certainly, too, Madam, as well as his inconstancy, make anybody who shall get a temporary possession of him when he comes to be King think of nothing but their own interest, and pushing it as fast as they can, without any view of what becomes of him, or any remorse for any inconveniences they may draw him into." "This, my dear Lord," said the Queen, "is what I have often told him; and, as I hope the King will live yet a great while, experience and growing wiser will, I hope, make this poor

1736 young man feel the truth of what he imagines now one always tells him with some view to one's own advantage, and not with any regard to his. I believe, too, what I dare say you do not, that there is nothing he dreads more at present than the King's death."—"I am so far from believing it," said Lord Hervey, "that I cannot comprehend your being serious when you say it is your opinion, and am firmly persuaded there is nothing he wishes so much; and that he does not esteem himself less capable of ruling wisely than Cæsar."—"You are mistaken," said the Queen. "Besides, the great debts he has contracted, payable at that time, make him apprehend this period still more."—"If that were any reason," said Lord Hervey, "for his wishing the King's life, he would wish it every day more than another, as it is a reason that, I fear, will be ever increasing, as long as the King and he shall live. And since Your Majesty has mentioned this, I must say one thing, which I have often thought of with great anxiety, and that is the danger there is of the King's days somehow or other being shortened by those profligate usurers who lend the Prince money upon these terms. I am sure, if I guess right, there are some who deal with the Prince for money payable at the King's death with most extortionate interest, who would want nothing but a fair opportunity to hasten the day of payment; and the King's manner of exposing himself a thousand different ways would make it full as easy for these fellows to accomplish such a design as their conscience would to form it."—"What you say," replied the Queen, "is certainly true. But what can be done?"—"Why, if no other means," said Lord Hervey, "can be found to put a stop to this every day increasing danger to the King's life, I am sure, for my own part, I would make no scruple of moving for an Act of Parliament to make it capital for any man to lend money for a premium at the King's death."—"To be sure," replied the Queen, "it ought to be so; and pray talk a little with Sir Robert Walpole about it."

The Queen used to speak to Lord Hervey on this 1736
subject with as little reserve when the Princess Caroline was present, as when alone; but never before the Princess Emily, who had managed her affairs so well as to have lost entirely the confidence of her mother, without having obtained the friendship of her brother. By trying to make her court by turns to both, she had by turns betrayed both, and at last lost both.

Lord Hervey was very ill with her. She had first used him ill, to flatter her brother, which of course had made him not use her very well; and the preference on every occasion he gave her sister, the Princess Caroline, completed their mutual dislike.

The Queen kept the King's birthday in London, but came from Kensington only that morning, and returned thither after the ball at night. There was a very thin appearance, and as little finery as if the same sumptuary law forbidding gold and silver that subsists at this time in the Court of Spain was in force here.

Sir Robert Walpole went the day after the birthday as usual into Norfolk for three weeks, the Duke of Devonshire to Newmarket, the Duke of Grafton and Lord Lifford to fox hunt in Suffolk, and nobody being left but the Duke of Newcastle at Court, the Queen desired Lord Hervey, who was to have gone into Suffolk for a fortnight to his father, to make his excuse, to say she had absolutely forbid him to leave her, and not stir from Kensington. Accordingly he did so, and was with Her Majesty not only every day, but almost all the day, talking over in different conversations a thousand particulars relating to the subjects I have here treated in short and thrown together in a loose way, that I might not, by a more accurate manner of ranging them, deviate from the manner in which the conversations passed.

And as I look upon these papers rather as fragments that might be wove into a history, than a history in themselves, so I generally put down such little particulars

1736 as can come to the knowledge of few historians, whilst I omit several which may be learned from every Gazette, and cannot fail to be inserted in the writings of every author who will treat of these times.

I am very sensible too what mere trifles several things are in themselves which I have related; but as I know that I myself have had a pleasure in looking at William Rufus's rusty stirrup, and the relics of a half worm-eaten chair in which Queen Mary sat when she was married in the Cathedral of Winchester to King Philip of Spain, it is for the sake of those who, like me, have an unaccountable pleasure in such trifling particulars relating to antiquity, that I take the trouble of putting many of the immaterial incidents I have described into black and white, and am very ready to give up the dignity of my character as an historian to the censures of those who may be pleased on this account to reflect upon it. Let them enjoy their great reflections on great events unenvied, and seek them elsewhere; and let those only hope for any satisfaction or amusement in my writings who look with more indifferent eyes on the surface of those splendid trifles and pry less metaphysically into the bottom of them, for it is to those only I write who prefer nature to gilding, truth to refinement, and have more pleasure in looking upon these great actors dressing and undressing than when they are representing their parts upon the public stage.

Let Machiavels give rules for the conduct of princes, and let Tacituses refine upon them; let the one embellish their writings with teaching, and the other with commenting on these great personages; let these make people imagine that letter theory can be reduced to common practice, and let those pretend to account for accidental steps by premeditated policy, whilst I content myself with only relating facts just as I see them, without pretending to impute the effects of chance to design, or to account for the great actions of great people always by great causes. Since the highest rank of people have as many and the

same passions as the lowest, and since the lowest have five 1736 senses, and none of the highest that I know of have six, I look upon the world, and every incident in it, to be produced as much from the same manner of thinking as I do the operations of kitchen-jacks and the finest repeating watches from the same laws of motion and the same rules of mechanism—the only difference is a little coarser or finer wheels.

The intrigues of Courts and private families are still the same game, and played with the same cards, the disparity in the skill of the gamesters in each equally great; there are excellently good and execrably bad, and the only difference is their playing more or less deep, whilst the cutting and shuffling, the dealing and the playing, is still the same whether the stakes be halfpence or millions.

But to return to my narrative from the impertinence of these reflections. The long-deferred, not much expected, and less wished-for orders of His Majesty for the yachts to set out for Holland at last arrived. The Queen gave these orders this year a very different welcome from that with which she received them the last. Last year she felt a sort of triumph in his return, when all the enemies of the Court had flattered themselves he would then defer his return in the same manner he had done now. The Queen, too, had flattered herself that he would come back from this gallantry as he had done before from former excursions of the same sort, and that in returning to her bed he would return to her arms and his former conjugal attachments. But as she had found herself so terribly deceived in these hopes and expectations the last year, and had so much less reason to form them this, she had nothing before her eyes for this winter but the revolution of the coldness she had felt the last; she considered this return only as a transition from the ease and liberty in which she had passed the summer, to an uninterrupted scene of disquiet and constraint; and knew the change for which she was to prepare was from receiving homage

1736 ■ paying it, and that she was to quit the company of those who were perpetually endeavouring, and with success, to please her, for the company of one whom she should be constantly endeavouring to please, and without success.

Between the 7th and 8th of December, in the night, after a great ball and a great supper, the King set out from Hanover, and arrived on the 11th at Helvoetsluys. The Princess Royal, four days before, after a terrible labour and being in great danger of her life, had been brought to bed at the Hague of a daughter, which Dr. Sands, a very eminent man-midwife sent from hence by the Queen, had been obliged to squeeze to death in the birth, to save the mother.

These circumstances did not, after all his former affection professed for his dear daughter Ann, awaken paternal love sufficient in His Majesty to engage him to make any visit at the Hague. He could say to Madame Walmoden, like Sappho to Phaon, "all other loves are lost in thine."

Dec. 14 The next Tuesday after he came to Helvoetsluys, whilst the people in England were employed in nothing but looking at weathercocks, and talking of tides and winds and moons, the wind changed on this side of the water for about eight or nine hours to the east, and everybody of course concluded His Majesty at sea. On Tuesday night it changed again, and a violent storm arose, which lasted four days, during which time there was not the least tidings of His Majesty. A hundred messages a day passed between the Admiralty Office and St. James's Palace; and a thousand conjectures were made with regard to the danger and safety of His Majesty, just as the different hopes and fears that were busy on this occasion, led people to wish or apprehend the one or the other. Many wagers were laid, and almost all the seafaring men laid that he was embarked.

The alacrity of the Prince and his Court on this occasion was not so ill-founded as it was indecent, nor so improperly felt as it was improperly shown. The wind

continuing very strong and contrary, every hour that brought no news added to the apprehension of bad news. 1736

On the Friday, during this consternation, the Prince gave a great dinner to the Lord Mayor of London and all the Aldermen at his house in Pall Mall, on their presenting him with the freedom of the City, a compliment which the Queen told me he had asked of my Lord Mayor by his saddler; Her Majesty adding at the same time the comment of its being in a very princely request, and made in a very princely manner.¹ There was another reflection she made on this occasion, which, though she said it made no impression upon her, one plainly saw it left some. The reflection was this, that King Charles I. when he was Prince of Wales, and King James II. when he was Duke of York, were the only two sons of kings that ever had had this freedom of the City conferred upon them. But as this remark was a sign of some relics of that Germanic superstition which the whole nation imbibe in their infancy, and few of them have sense enough to rub off when they are grown up, so I must own it was one which was much more natural for her to make, considering her education than considering her understanding. Dec. 17

Lord Hervey dined this disagreeable Friday at Sir Robert Walpole's. As they were going together in the chariot, Sir Robert seemed full of many melancholy reflections, and to wish the King's safety much less for the sake of the King than for the rest of the family. He said, and very truly: "If any accident should happen to our sweet master, whom I feel more peevish with than I can express, I do not know, my dear Lord, any people in the world so much to be pitied as that gay young company with which you and I stand every day in the drawing-room,

¹Lord Egmont records a year and a half later that the King, on being told that the Princess of Wales had given birth to a boy (the future George III) "only laughed and said the saddler's wife was brought to bed; alluding to the Prince being governor of the Saddler's Company." (Egmont, 24th May, 1738.)

1736 at that door from which we this moment came, bred up in state, in affluence, caressed and courted, and to go at once from that into dependence on a brother who loves them not, and whose extravagance and covetousness (*alieni appetens, sui profusus*) will make him grudge every guinea they spend, as it must come from out of a purse not sufficient to defray the expenses of his own vices. On the other hand, what a situation is the Queen's, between the Scylla and Charybdis of falling into the hands of a son who hates her, or receiving a husband whom she has as much reason to hate; and who, if one was to see her heart, perhaps she loves the least of the two, as she thinks she has not been better used by him when she has deserved everything from him! What will be the Prince's case? A poor, weak, irresolute, false, lying, dishonest, contemptible wretch, that nobody loves, that nobody believes, that nobody will trust, and that will trust everybody by turns; and that everybody by turns will impose upon, betray, mislead, and plunder. And what then will become of this divided family, and this divided country, is too melancholy a prospect for one to admit conjecture to paint it."

Lord Hervey said that, with regard to the avarice and profusion of the Prince, he agreed it would make him do a thousand wrong things, and by the by said he wondered that that part of Catiline's character drawn by Sallust should be thought so extraordinary a one, when, in his opinion, there were no two qualities oftener went together. "But, Sir," continued Lord Hervey, "there is one very material point in which I differ from you, and that is concerning the influence the Queen would have over the Prince if ever he came to be King; I am far from believing her interest there would be so low as you imagine." "Zounds, my Lord," interrupted Sir Robert, very eagerly, "he would tear the flesh off her bones with hot irons; the notion he has of her making his father do everything she has a mind to, and the father doing nothing the son has a mind to, joined to that rancour which those about him

are continually whetting against his mother, would make 1736
him use her worse than you or I can foresee; his resentment for the distinctions she shows to you too, I believe, would not be forgotten. Then the notion he has of her great riches, and the desire he would feel to be fingering them, would make him pinch her and pinch her again, in order to make her buy her ease, till she had not a groat left."

This conversation broke off by their arrival at Sir Robert's house.

The Queen, at St. James's, passed her common evenings just as she had done at Kensington; that is, in her private apartment at quadrille with her lady-in-waiting, Mrs. Schutz, and Lady Charlotte de Roucy; whilst the Princess Caroline, Miss Dives (one of her maids of honour), and Lord Hervey played pools at cribbage, and the Duke, Princess Emily, and the rest of the chance-comers of the family played at basset. Mondays and Fridays, however, there were public drawing-rooms in the great apartments, in the same manner as when the King used to be in London. This Friday, therefore, that the Queen might betray no apprehension or disquiet, there was a public drawing-room as usual, to which neither the Prince nor Princess came. The Prince made no excuse, the Princess pleaded a cold, but the only marks of it that appeared was a black-hood.

The next morning the Queen sent for Lord Hervey earlier than usual, and nobody but the Princess Caroline being by, they talked very freely of the present situation of affairs. The Queen asked Lord Hervey if he had heard any of the particulars of yesterday's feast in Pall Mall, whether he knew if the Prince went thither to toast in the afternoon, and what healths were drank. Lord Hervey said he had heard the Prince's speech in the morning was the most ingratiating piece of popularity that ever was composed, and that, if he did go to his guests after dinner, he concluded the healths were in the same style; and

2736 neither the "Prosperity of the City of London"—"the Trade of this Country"—"the Naval Strength of England"—"Liberty and Property"—nor any popular toasts of that kind were omitted. "My God," says the Queen, "popularity always makes me sick; but Fretz's popularity makes me vomit. I hear that yesterday, on his side of the house, they talked of the King's being cast away with the same sang-froid as you would talk of a coach being overturned, and that my good son strutted about as if he had been already King. Did you mind the air with which he came into my drawing-room in the morning, though he does not think fit to honour me with his presence or ennui me with his wife's of a night? I swear his behaviour shocked me so prodigiously, that I could hardly bring myself to speak to him when he was with me afterwards; I felt something here in my throat that swelled and half-choked me." "I presume," said Lord Hervey, "Your Majesty and the Princess Caroline are not of that opinion still, on which I disputed with you at Kensington. You do not imagine, I believe, now, that the Prince has all that horror of being King which you then supposed." "Oh!" replied the Queen, "he is such an ass that one cannot tell what he thinks; and yet he is not so great a fool as you take him for neither." "There is one thing in which I think of him very differently from Your Majesty, and which proves I think him wiser than you do." "What is that?" said the Queen. "It is," replied Lord Hervey, "that Your Majesty in a month, if he came to the crown, would have more weight with him than anybody in England." "Jesus!" interrupted the Princess Caroline, "my good Lord, you must know very little of him if you believe that; for in the first place he hates Mama; in the next, he has so good an opinion of himself that he thinks he wants no advice, and of all advice no woman's; for the saying, no woman ought to be let to meddle with business or ever did any good where they did meddle, is perhaps the only thing in which I have heard him ever contradict himself."

The Queen exclaimed, too, against Lord Hervey's 1736 opinion, and asked him upon what it was possible for him to found it. He said: "Upon knowing, Madam, how susceptible he is of impressions, and how capable Your Majesty is of giving them. He is, Madam, a mere bank of sand, and anybody may write upon one as easy as the other." "And what one writes is as easily too," said the Queen, "rubbed out of one as the other. Besides, they would never let him come near me." "They would try, I acknowledge," replied Lord Hervey, "if they were wise, and not your friends, to hinder him coming near you, for fear that, like Archimedes, if you got one inch of footing you might disturb the motions of their little globe; but it would not be in their power to hinder him." "For my part," interrupted the Princess Caroline, "I should desire to run out of the house *au grand galop*, as fast as I could." "No," said the Queen, "I would not stir before my proper time out of the house; but supposing I stayed in it," continued Her Majesty, turning to Lord Hervey, "why do you imagine I should see him?" "Because I am sure," answered Lord Hervey, "I know just how he would think and reason upon that occasion. He would think to conciliate the great king and the dutiful son, and would say he would come and show Your Majesty all the respect due to a mother; but if you offered to meddle with business, he would insist on the respect due to the dignity of his own character as king, and impose an absolute silence upon you with regard to any matters of that sort; and as I know the prevalence of truth, and the art Your Majesty has of letting it lose none of its weight in your hands, you would, under a justification of your past conduct, make him see the things he had most objected to in so different a light from that he had before viewed them, and make him so sensibly feel the propriety and necessity of those parts of your conduct which he had most disliked, that you would soon bring him to bear you on present circumstances after you had reconciled him to

1736 past occurrences. You would let him know that the prompt violences of the King's temper, and the factious turbulent spirit of this nation, had made the part you had to act so difficult, that, in order to make the whole go on, you had been often forced to suffer several particular wheels to take a course which, if it had not been with a view to the not obstructing the motions of others, you would certainly have tried to turn differently; and as the good of the whole had always been your primary view, you would then appeal to his recollection whether anything you had ever done had not tended to the welfare and security of your family in general, and whether you had ever submitted to anything that had lessened the dignity and rights of the Crown, or attempted anything that might hurt the liberties or infringe the privileges of the people. You would bid him then reflect on your conduct either as a queen, a wife, or a mother, and desiring him to lay all general charges and insinuations aside, which might always be endless, and consequently unanswerable, you would ask him to name any particular action where you had acted unbecoming the duties of those several stations. It would afterwards be very natural for Your Majesty to add, that as you could have nothing at heart but the quiet continuance of your family upon this throne, whilst every other body about him must have some private views and interests of their own to serve, so it could never be of any prejudice to him to hear what you had to tell him, whether he paid any regard to it or not; and it would then be as natural for him to hear you as it must be for everybody to regard you when they have heard you."

"My Lord," said the Queen, "you have spoken a great deal better for me than I could do for myself; but could I speak as well, I promise you it would be to no purpose. The chief objection he makes to the King's conduct at present is the confidence the King has in me." "Supposing that to be the present case," replied Lord Hervey, "there is no judgment to be made from thence of his future

conduct; for his opinions are so fluctuating, and his sentiments so variable, that if one body had saved his life at the peril of their own, and another had been suspected of bribing one of his pages to infuse arsenic in his chocolate, and the King were to die a week after these incidents, one of these people would stand just as good a chance as the other to be employed by him. Besides, Your Majesty being *au fait* of all transactions both foreign and domestic for these last ten years, he would naturally come to you for intelligence, if not for advice; and as the manner of giving intelligence is often advice without wearing the appearance of it, I am very apt to believe Your Majesty would often be able to mix what he would not be able to separate." The Queen said Lord Hervey imagined she should give herself much more trouble about these matters than he would find, if ever the case happened, that she should be inclined to do. Lord Hervey answered, that he imagined he should always find Her Majesty acting the part that became her; and as it would be her duty to her son, to herself, and her whole family, her adherents, and, indeed, to the nation, to speak her mind freely on these things, to check the indiscretions of her son by showing him the risks he ran, and convince him of his errors by representing truth to him, he was very sure he should never see the Queen indolently looking on whilst the Prince was endangering the whole, but that she would endeavour to prevent the wreck which so unskilful a pilot left to himself would, in all probability, bring upon all that were embarked in the same bottom. The Queen sighed, and said she hoped all this was mere speculation, and that she should never live to see the case happen; but that if she did, she was sure she would never silently be witness to his taking such steps as might shake her family's possession of the throne, but would certainly do all she could to prevent his pursuing any measures that she thought led to such dangerous consequences. "But what do you think of the King's being embarked,"

1736 continued the Queen, "from all you have heard? For my part I own I am sometimes staggered." Lord Hervey said he firmly believed he was not at sea.

In the afternoon, however, that is this Saturday, the 18th, the Prince came to the Queen with a letter he had got, written to one Mrs. Cowper, from a correspondent of hers at Harwich, in which it was said that in the middle of the foregoing night, during the storm, guns had been heard at sea, which were taken for guns of distress, and that there was no doubt made at Harwich but that these guns belonged to part of the fleet that was to come with the King, and had been dispersed, if not to the yacht on which the King was himself on board. Lord Baltimore, who was a great sailor himself, and thought to have great skill in sea-affairs, told Lord Hervey this very night, at the Opera, that it was impossible but that the King must have been embarked, and advised Lord Hervey to speak to the Queen for some ships to be immediately sent out to see what was become of him. Lord Hervey said it was impossible, he thought, if the King had set sail, that the whole fleet should be lost, or that some one ship should not have made to shore in some part of the island, by which it would have been known at least that the King had left the Dutch coast. Lord Baltimore said that in this storm, with a full westerly wind, which had now lasted four days and nights, it was absolutely impossible for any ship to have put in to any port on the English coast. From the Opera Lord Hervey went directly to the Queen's apartment, where she was already at play, as usual, to tell her what he had heard; but he had not been in the room three minutes before a messenger, in his dirty boots, arrived, to the great joy of the whole company, with a letter to the Queen from the King, to let her know he had never stirred out of Helvoetsluys, and that the weather was so uncertain he did not know when he should. This messenger had been three days at sea, and, with this storm full in his teeth, had landed by miracle (as all the skilful in maritime

affairs called it) at Yarmouth. The joy the Queen was in 1736 when she saw this messenger come into the room, and heard everybody crying "The King is safe! The King is safe!", showed that her apprehension had been greater than she ever owned it; for upon reading the King's letter, she said: "J'ai toujours dit que le Roi n'était pas embarqué: on a beau voulu m'effraier cet après-dîner avec leur lettres, et leur sots gens de Harwich; j'ai continué à lire mon Rollin, et me moquois de tout cela."

Sir Robert Walpole was gone to Richmond Park (which, by the by, the Queen did not take very well), so Lord Hervey despatched a messenger immediately to him to let him know the good news, but did not venture to tell him that he found the Queen looked upon his retirement with Miss Skeritt to Richmond Park just at this juncture as a piece of gallantry which, considering the anxiety in which he left Her Majesty, might have been spared, as well as the gallantry of His Majesty's journey to Hanover which had occasioned that anxiety.

As the Prince's fears for the King's safety had been so busy in communicating themselves this afternoon to the Queen, Her Majesty thought the least she could do for so dutiful a son was to take the first opportunity to quiet them. As soon as ever she had read the King's letter; therefore, she sent Lord Grantham (her Lord Chamberlain) to the Prince's apartment to communicate the most material part of the contents of it, which was His Majesty being safe in the harbour of Helvoetsluys.

The joy of this news lasted not long, for early on the Monday morning following (which was the 20th), the wind coming easterly, and continuing so till night, there was now no doubt made by anybody of the King's being embarked; and upon the wind changing at night to north-west, and blowing a most prodigious storm, as little doubt was made of his being in great danger.

Till Friday, the 24th, there was no news of him at all, and then none that was very agreeable; for a sloop, with

1736 some clerks belonging to the secretary's office on board, that had sailed with His Majesty from Helvoetsluys on Monday, and continued with the fleet till the storm arose, brought intelligence (being thrown without masts and extremely shattered on this coast) that the master of this sloop had seen the King's yacht tack about, but they knew nothing more either of him or any other ship in the fleet. In order to give the Queen as little alarm as possible, Sir Robert Walpole and Lord Harrington agreed to prevent the Queen seeing these clerks, and to take their account in writing, which was barely this, that on the first shifting of the wind they had seen the yacht on a signal tack about for Helvoetsluys, and that no doubt was to be made of the King's being now there. The next day (which was Christmas Day) four of the men-of-war that made part of His Majesty's convoy were thrown upon this coast, and made shift, after being obliged, too, like the sloop, to cut all their masts, to scramble into four different harbours. All the news any of these ships could give of the King or the rest of the fleet was that about six o'clock on Monday night a gun was fired by Sir Charles Wager's order as a signal, on this stress of weather, for every ship to take care of itself, and that soon after they were all separated, the tempest continuing its violence (the wind still at north-west) for forty-eight hours after. One of the letters that brought this intelligence was written by Lord Augustus Fitzroy, second son to the Duke of Grafton, who, though but twenty years of age, was captain of one of these men-of-war, and had with great difficulty this morning got into Margate. There was another to the Duke of Richmond from Mr. Clayton, one of the King's equerries, who was waiting with His Majesty's relays at Harwich, that gave the same account of this prodigious tempest, from the captain of another ship that had put in at Harwich. And as there were many other accounts, all to the same effect, from several other seaports, the whole town was in agitation, inquiring what was become of the King, some

hoping, others fearing, and most people believing, he was 1736
at the bottom of the sea.

As there could be nothing done immediately, either to get certain intelligence what was become of the King, or to provide for his safety, it was determined not to tell the Queen this news to-night, as it could have no effect but keeping her awake all night to no purpose. She and her daughters therefore passed this, like other evenings, at play; whilst Sir Robert Walpole, the Dukes of Newcastle, Grafton, Montagu, Devonshire, Richmond, and Lord Hervey, with very heavy hearts, put on the cheerfulest countenances they could, and talked of many things, whilst all their thoughts were employed only on one.

The next morning (Sunday, the 26th) Sir Robert Walpole came at nine o'clock to the Queen, and acquainted her with all he knew and all he feared.

The Queen no longer endeavoured to constrain herself and wear the appearance of ease on this news, but gave a loose to her tears, which indeed flowed in great abundance. On the Prince's side there was nothing to be seen but whisperers, messengers running backwards and forwards, and countenances that seemed already to belong to those who had the dominion of this country in their hands, and the affairs of Europe revolving in their minds.

The Queen determined she would go to chapel as usual, for no good reason, in my opinion, since it was just as natural for the anxiety and concern she was in to keep her in her apartment, as it was for her to feel that anxiety and concern in the present uncertain state of the King's welfare. The reason she gave to some about her for setting herself up to be stared at in public in these disagreeable circumstances was that she would not suppose her husband drowned before it was sure he was so; and that, as he had given the Government into her hands, she would perform the duty of those who had that honour till the

1736 law took it from her and transferred it to another; but this manner of reasoning was, I think, rather dictated by her pride than by her understanding.

She had not been half an hour in the chapel before an express arrived from the King to Her Majesty to let her know that, after setting sail from Helvoetsluys on Monday morning at eight o'clock, he had with great difficulty regained that port the next day at three in the afternoon; that the storm had been very violent, and he very sick; that one of the yachts, called the Charlotte, was missing; and that they knew nothing of any of the men-of-war, but were in hopes, as they were better able to resist the tempest than the yachts, that they had by this time made some harbour. The King in his letter said, too, that he had not insisted on embarking when he did, but had done it in pursuance of Sir Charles Wager's directions, who had sent to him twice to make what haste he could on board, the wind and tide being then favourable.

The Queen, after communicating the principal contents of this letter (which was the King's safety) to everybody about her at chapel, and after chapel in the circle in the drawing-room, owned she had gone to chapel with a heavier heart than she had ever before felt in her breast; that she really thought the King had been lost, and would willingly have compounded for his being in Norway or any the remotest part of the world; and that all she wished was to be sure that he was still in being. These are exactly her own words.

To many she said that to be sure her particular loss would have been very great, but that the King's death would have been a loss which not only she, but this whole kingdom, and Europe itself at this juncture, would have felt most sensibly, and that her chief concern had been not so much for any particular consideration as for the whole.

She then told everybody how glad she was to find by the King's letter that the damage that had been done,

the danger of so many lives, and the loss of some, had not 1736
been owing to the King's impatience to set sail, for that
His Majesty had submitted himself entirely to Sir Charles
Wager's government, and embarked in consequence of
his directions.

But this account of the King's patience and ductility
nobody believed; by which means the Queen on this
occasion, as it often happens on many others, weakened
the King's justification by endeavouring to strengthen
it; for had she stuck to the truth of the fact, and not to the
letter of his account, it would have been a much better,
as well as a sufficient apology for the King; it would have
thoroughly disculpated His Majesty, and not left him
chargeable with any of the disagreeable consequences of
his embarkation; for the real state of this case was that he
had been very impatient to set sail for England, and Sir
Charles Wager as obstinate in preventing him till it was
proper he should; and when he did embark, the wind had
been fair for several hours.

What made the Queen's account of the King's patience
more ridiculous was that there was nobody in the room
who had not heard, and few who had not seen, accounts
from all about His Majesty at Helvoetsluys that his
impatience was insupportable; Sir Charles Wager's and
Horace Walpole's letters were full of nothing else;
examples, too, were given of it. It was known by everybody
from these letters that the King had declared if Sir Charles
Wager would not sail, His Majesty would go in a packet-
boat; that he had told Sir Charles he would go; and that
Sir Charles, in his laconic Spartan style, had told him he
could not; that the King had said: "Let it be what weather
it will, I am not afraid"; and that Sir Charles Wager
had replied, "If you are not, I am"; that His Majesty had
sworn he had rather be twelve hours in a storm than twenty-
four more at Helvoetsluys; upon which Sir Charles had
told him he need not wish for twelve, for four would do
his business; and that, when the King by the force of

1736 importunity had obliged Sir Charles Wager to sail, Sir Charles had told him: "Well, Sir, you can oblige me to go, but I can make you come back again." These dialogues and bon-mots were in all the private letters but His Majesty's and in everybody's mouth; so what faith any report of His Majesty's patience met with is easy to be imagined. Even the King in his letter owned to the Queen that he had told Sir Charles Wager he wished to see a storm at sea, and that Sir Charles, immediately on his return to Helvoetsluys, had asked him if his curiosity was satisfied, to which His Majesty said he had answered: "So thoroughly satisfied that I do not desire ever to see another." Sir Charles Wager, in his letter that gave this account of what had passed between him and the King subsequent to this storm, added that His Majesty was at present as tame as any about him, an epithet for his behaviour that His Majesty, had he known it, would, I fancy, have liked, next to the storm, the least of anything that happened to him. As to his danger, by all accounts that I heard of it, it is impossible for any I can give to exaggerate it. After the report made by the ships that came in on Saturday, there were very few people who imagined it possible His Majesty should have escaped. They were knocking the fine apartment built for him in his own yacht on the quarter-deck all to pieces, and threw all the wood materials as well as all the rich furniture overboard. The skill and conduct of the captain of His Majesty's yacht, as well as Sir Charles Wager's behaviour, was extremely commended.

The King's danger did not in the least soften the minds of the people towards him; a thousand impertinent and treasonable reflections were thrown out against him every day publicly in the streets, such as wishing him at the bottom of the sea, that he had been drowned instead of some of the poor sailors that had been washed off the decks, and many other affectionate douceurs in the same style. Somebody asking, two or three days after the

tempest, how the wind was now for the King, was answered: "Like the nation—against him." 1736

There was a fellow too, who, coming into an ale-house where several soldiers were drinking, said: "I suppose you are all brave English boys, and therefore conclude you will pledge me,—'Here is damnation to your master.'" The soldiers at first suspected it was somebody sent to try and ensnare them; but the fellow persisting, and saying the King hated the nation, and he saw no reason why the nation should not hate him, that he was gone to Hanover only to spend English money there, and bring back a Hanover whore here, the soldiers began to believe him thoroughly in earnest; upon which a serjeant among them went and fetched a constable, and had him apprehended. When the serjeant went and told Sir Robert Walpole what had passed, Sir Robert rewarded him, but bid him, in the affidavit he was to make, leave out the account of the English money and Hanover whore, the rest being enough to make the fellow punishable without descending into these particulars.

The Queen, notwithstanding she was not unacquainted with this almost universal dissatisfaction of the nation towards the King, was in great spirits for two or three days after the news came of his being safe returned to Holland; and perhaps the apprehension she had been in for His Majesty's life was the only thing that could have made her look on his return to England not as the greatest misfortune that could befall her.

She said the agitation she had been in twice within this fortnight, first for fear of her daughter's dying in childbed, and next for fear of her husband being drowned, had left her so stupefied that she could not recover her spirits, though her fears no longer subsisted. She owned, too, that what she felt for the King was so much more than what she had felt for the Princess Royal, that from the Friday when the sloop came in (notwithstanding the account it brought had been so softened to her) till the

1736 messenger came on Sunday, she had entirely forgot that the Princess Royal was in her bed, or that there was any such body in the world. It is sure that nothing could exceed the apprehension the Queen had at this time of her son's ascending the throne, as there were no lengths she did not think him capable of going to pursue and ruin her.

Lord Hervey, when she told him of these apprehensions, still persisted in saying, as he had done before, that he was sure there would be nobody in a week who would have had so good an interest in the Prince, if this accident had happened, as herself; and that he was so convinced of it, and thought it so advantageous not only for her own family but for the whole nation that she should have that interest with her son, that he had determined to absent himself from her for some time, in case the King had been lost, that the partiality she showed him might have been no additional irritation of circumstances between her and her son. He was going on, but the Queen stopped him short, and said: "No, my Lord; I should never have suffered that; you are one of the greatest pleasures of my life. But did I love you less than I do, or like less to have you about me, I should look upon the suffering you to be taken from me, or the suffering you to take yourself from me upon such an occasion, after the manner in which you have lived with me and behaved to me, to be such a reflection upon me, and to betray such a meanness and baseness in me, that I assure you, you should not have stirred an inch from me. You and yours should have gone with me to Somerset House; and, though I have neither so good an apartment for you there as you have here, nor an employment worth your taking, I should have lodged you as well as I could, and given you at least as much as you have now from the King; and should have thought this the least I could do for my own honour, and the best thing I could do for my own pleasure. Sir Robert Walpole, too, I know, said he would retire; but I assure you I would have begged

him on my knees not to desert my son." Many more things passed on these subjects in this conversation; but, as I have already extracted the quintessence in what I have said, I pass over the rest of the particulars, to avoid prolixity and repetition. 1736

The letter the Queen wrote to the King on his danger and her fears, his escape and her joy, was full of all the blandishments which ingenuity, art, insinuation, and flattery could suggest; with a most ample account not only of the conduct but even of the countenances of everybody belonging to the Court, each being particularly specified by name. I did not see this letter; but the King's answer was so minute to every article which the Queen's letter had contained, that, the style and turn of the phrases excepted, anybody was as well acquainted with the one by seeing the other as if they had read both. The passion and tenderness of the King's letter to her, which consisted of thirty pages, must be incredible to any one who did not see it. Whoever had read it without knowing from whom it came, or to whom it was addressed, would have concluded it written by some young sailor of twenty to his first mistress, after escaping from a storm in his first voyage. "*Malgré tout le danger que j'ai essuié dans cette tempête, ma chère Caroline, et malgré tout ce que j'ai souffert, en étant malade à un point que je ne croiois pas que le corps humain pourroit souffrir, je vous jure que je m'exposerois encore et encore pour avoir le plaisir d'entendre les marques de votre tendresse que cette situation m'a procuré. Cette affection que vous me témoignez, cette amitié, cette fidélité, cette bonté inépuisable que vous avez pour moi, et cette indulgence pour toutes mes foiblesses, sont des obligations que je ne sçaurai jamais récompenser, que je ne sçaurai jamais mériter, mais que je ne sçaurai jamais oublier non plus.*" His Majesty then spoke of his extreme impatience for their meeting, and in a style that would have made one believe him the rival of Hercules's vigour, and her of Venus's

1736 beauty, her person being mentioned in the most exalted strains of rapture, and his own eagerness to feed, after these three weeks of total abstinence, in the warmest phrases that youthful poets could use in elegies to their mistresses. Added to these things, there was an exact diary in this letter of everything he had heard, done, or said for five days, which concluded with a pathetic petition to the Queen not to believe the length of this letter was owing to idleness and leisure, but to the earnest desire he always had of hiding no thought from her, and that he never was more desirous than at that moment of opening his heart to her, because it had never felt warmer towards her.

Whoever reads this account of the King's conduct and letters can possibly make no other comment upon it than: "Quel galimatias! quel potpourri!"

When the Queen gave Sir Robert Walpole the King's letter to read she said: "Do not think, because I show you this, that I am an old fool, and vain of my person and charms at this time of day. I am reasonably pleased with it, but I am not unreasonably proud of it." When Sir Robert Walpole and Lord Hervey talked over this letter, they both agreed they had a most incomprehensible master, and (though neither of them were very partial to His Majesty) they also agreed that, with a woman who could be gained by writing, they had rather have any man in the world for a rival than the King. Nor, indeed, in the gift of writing love-letters do I believe any man ever surpassed him. He had the easiest, the most natural, and the warmest manner of expressing himself that I ever met with, with the prettiest words and the most agreeable turns I ever saw put together.

By the accounts from both sides of the water it appeared, though there had been many men lost in the late storm, that all the vessels were safe, though excessively shattered. The Charlotte yacht was the last heard of; but, after being a fortnight missing, they had an account of

her from a port she had made in Zealand. But whilst 1737 the King remained at Helvoetsluys, he had the mortification of seeing the "Princess Louisa," one of the ships ordered back to Holland from hence to convoy His Majesty to England, together with a merchant ship, lost on the sands, just as they were entering the port, by the fault of a drunken pilot. Seventeen men were drowned.

The water was not the only element at present that made its rigour talked of; for a fire at this time breaking out Jan. 4 at the Temple, it burnt for several hours with such fury, that it was feared the whole building would have been consumed. The Prince went at nine o'clock at night, and stayed till five in the morning, to assist with his skill, advice, and authority to extinguish it; and to his timely care in ordering a hundred and fifty men from the Savoy he and many others imputed the Temple being saved, after the loss of five or six houses. The Queen had ordered a guard from St. James's on the first news of the fire breaking out; but all merit of assistance was given to the Prince. He exerted himself so much there, that, as he and his people said, several of the mob cried out: "Crown him! crown him!" but whether this really happened I am unable to affirm; it is certain it was reported to have happened among all ranks of people through the whole town, and generally believed. But what induces me to think it was not true is, that the Princess Caroline told Lord Hervey she knew her brother or some of his people had said, about a fortnight ago, that the same exclamation of "Crown him! crown him!" was made at the play; and that she knew from people who had been there that it was a lie, and nothing like it had passed. The Prince, the morning after the fire had happened, when he came to give an account of it to the Queen, said not one word of this crowning incident, though in no other particular did his report at all diminish the honours which had been paid him, the pains he had taken, the use he had been of, or the great service he

1737 had done the public. Among other things, he pretended to have received two great blows on his head whilst he was assisting the firemen to convey the water; and, upon the Queen's asking whereabouts he had received those blows, he directed her fingers through his periwig to the places where he pretended to have been struck; whilst she (who told Lord Hervey afterwards that she felt nothing at all) cried out, "Really that is no jest: there are two bumps as big as two eggs."

Lord Hervey told the Queen he did not at all wonder at the Prince's conduct, or that he was drunk with vanity, considering the cordials with which the people about him were perpetually plying that passion; nor was it at all surprising he should believe (when it had been so often by these creatures inculcated) that he was so much beloved by the nation, and the King so much hated, that it was nothing but the popularity of the son that kept the father upon the throne; to which she very pertinently answered that according to the reports at present of the son's popularity, that popularity, instead of keeping the father upon the throne, was to depose him.

This naturally brought on again the conversation of what a deplorable situation this country would have been in had the King been drowned; for, as the Prince was known to be so unstable, so false, and consequently so dangerous, few people, it was agreed, who were not very necessitous in their circumstances, if they had sense, till they saw the first turbulency of his reign a little subsided, would have coveted being employed under him, as it would be staking their head against the poor prospect of a temporary power, and very uncertain gain. The Queen said her son's situation would not be more to be envied than the nation's; for, as he would at first think himself capable of managing and conducting everything, and soon find himself capable of managing and conducting nothing, so his timidity—"for you know," said she, "he is the greatest coward in the world"—will make him

commit his affairs to anybody that happens to be next 1737
him, and will take the charge of them, and, when he has
done so, it is a hundred to one it is to somebody that would
not be capable of serving him if he would allow them the
proper means, and very sure that, if they had the capacity,
his impatience would not allow that capacity time to
operate. She intimated that his betters had found them-
selves in the same difficulties; though, by a prudent and
happy choice of a minister to do what they had vainly
fancied they could do alone, they had extricated themselves
out of them, as well as by a firmness, which was the quality
in the world most necessary to support a Prince in this
country, and one which she feared her son could never
be reasoned into. Lord Hervey said that everybody
knowing beforehand in that case how short the oppor-
tunity they were to profit by was likely to be, they would
certainly do by the Prince as the mob do at a funeral:
every one would enrich themselves with any bit of him
they could catch, and not care a farthing what they tore
or spoiled. The Queen told Lord Hervey that it behoved
everybody who had any valuable possessions in this
country, or any regard to the quiet of it, to prevent that
havoc, whether they had any regard for the Prince or not;
for as he could not be ruined without endangering their
security, so, when once he was King, it would be wise and
prudent in everybody to keep him from tottering, as it
would be for a ship's crew to take care of the main-mast
to which the principal sails and tackle were fastened,
and that could not fall without endangering many lives, and
making not only the course of the ship less steady, but
even its safety very precarious. Lord Hervey said in some
storms at sea, though it was a desperate remedy, people
found themselves obliged to cut away the mainmast; and,
though danger attended the doing it, there was more
sometimes in letting it alone. "In short," said the Queen,
"a popish King will be surer ruin to this country than
any other can bring upon it; and whenever you change

1737 a King of this family, it will neither be for no King, nor for any other Protestant King. All sensible people, therefore, must think of the Prince in this way: there he is, he must be King, and we will make the best we can of him, though we cannot make him so good as we would."

Lord Hervey did not tell the Queen that this was at present the case of the father, and that those who seemed most attached to his interest, were really so only upon this foot; but had he made her this answer, it would only have been improper, not untrue, His Majesty's character with all ranks of people being fallen so low that the disregard with which everybody spoke of him, and the open manner in which they expressed their contempt and dislike, is hardly to be credited. The enlightened state of the nation with respect to any reverence due to the Crown further than the merit of the head that wore it might claim made very little come to His Majesty's share. His conduct of late had convinced the distant part of the nation of what those who had the honour to be more near him had discovered long ago, which was his preferring his German to his English subjects at least as much as his father had done. Those about him knew, too, that he cared for no one of them, that he thought them all overpaid in their several stations for whatever service they did him, and as he looked upon them all with as little mixture of favour as he did on his chairs or tables, or any piece of necessary furniture, so he was perpetually grumbling at Sir Robert Walpole on account of the price he paid for the one, in the same manner as he would have done at a joiner for having charged him too much in any article of his bill for the other. This made even the most sensible people about him feel no affection for him; and those who were less so were fond of declaring the opinion they had of him for fear of being thought his dupes, and ran into the other extreme, as some people declare themselves atheists for fear of being thought bigots.

On Saturday morning at four o'clock an express arrived 1737
at St. James's to acquaint the Queen that the King had Jan. 15
landed the day before about noon at Lowestoft, after having
been detained five weeks at Helvoetsluys, and now obliged
at last to come with a contrary wind all the way. The
Queen had been ill the day before, had not rested in the
night, and when Sir Robert Walpole came at nine in
the morning to concert what was to be done on the King's
arrival, Her Majesty was trying to sleep, with the Princess
Caroline only with her reading at her bedside. At the same
time the Prince coming to wish his mother joy of this
good news, and meeting Sir Robert in the antechamber,
he made him sit down, and they two, with the Princess
Emily only present, had a conference that lasted till the
Queen waked and called for them in, which was at least
two hours and a half. Many things were discoursed of,
but the quintessence of the conversation, which Sir
Robert Walpole related to me in detail, was that the
Prince told Sir Robert he had always looked upon him
as one of the ablest men in England, that he had always
had the greatest regard for him imaginable, and that, if
ever his looks or actions seemed to speak his sentiments to
be different from what he now professed, they were neither
what he would have them be, nor faithful interpreters
of his thoughts. Sir Robert thanked him for his good
opinion, and the honour he did him; said he had always
endeavoured to serve the King to the best of his ability;
that all Kings were obliged to take measures which
often they could not, and often they would not, explain
their motives for, though the more those motives were
explained, perhaps the more justifiable the measures
would appear; but though that sometimes should happen
not to be the case, he would venture to affirm that,
considering the disputed title to this Crown, consider-
ing the temper of this nation, their readiness to dis-
approve, and their love of change, it could never be
the interest of the Prince of Wales to quarrel with his

1737 father for private reasons, and that whoever flattered the Prince by telling him he could be a gainer by opposing his father's measures must either be the worst or the weakest of mankind.

END OF VOLUME II

Printed in Great Britain for
EYRE AND SPOTTISWOODE (PUBLISHERS) LTD
6, Great New Street, London, E.C.4.

